

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. XX

Summer Number, 1951

No. 3

EDITORIAL BOARD

NOLAN B. HARMON, *Editor-in-Chief*

ERMINIE HUNTRESS LANTERO, *Assistant Editor*

JOHN BAILLIE

CLARENCE T. CRAIG

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE

ROBBINS W. BARSTOW

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

G. ASHTON OLDHAM

SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT

JOHN KNOX

HOWARD C. ROBBINS

GERALD R. CRAGG

PAUL E. SCHERER

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Joseph Haroutunian

Harold C. Phillips

D. Elton Trueblood

Paul Bentley Kern

Richard Campbell Raines

Leslie D. Weatherhead

Earl Bowman Marlatt

Edward T. Ramsdell

Theodore O. Wedel

W. E. McCulloch

Carl C. Rasmussen

Luther A. Weigle

Robert Hastings Nichols

R. Frederick West

CONTENTS

PAGE

Critic or Apologist of Civilization?.....Emil Brunner 323

Religion and Education: First Principles.....Henry P. Van Dusen 329

Is a "Christian Foreign Policy" Possible?.....Fred W. Riggs 338

Phillips Brooks and the Incarnation.....Francis Gerald Ensley 350

Jewish Universalism.....Bernard J. Bamberger 362

Shakespeare and Redemptive Love.....Robert E. Fitch 374

Educating for Democracy in Africa.....John M. Springer 382

The Great Divide: Experience Versus Tradition.....Cecil Northcott 396

Anglican Recognition of Presbyterian Ordinations.....George J. Cleveland 403

A "Right Strawy Epistle".....F. J. Yetter 416

The Nature of Sanctity: A Comparison of Two Nineteenth-Century Saints

Ernest Wall 425

James Montgomery and His Contribution to English Hymnody

John H. Johansen 438

What America Owes to George Whitefield.....Albert D. Belden 445

Having Deposed Zeus.....Calvin T. Ryan 450

Book Reviews..... 457

Copyright, 1951, by Pierce and Smith. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

Published by

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

150 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

"The Lord's Prayer and Our Prayer"

GEORGE A. BUTTRICK

TWO SIGNS of Jesus abide, though all else be ignored or forgotten—a prayer and a cross. People who are ignorant about the Bible can recite the Lord's Prayer, and they know that Jesus was crucified. These are his memorial; not a tombstone or a moneyed foundation, but a simple prayer and a gallows set against the daybreak. About five hundred million people say the prayer. If they really prayed it, they could change the world. Napoleon once asked, "Do you wish to see that which is really sublime?" and answered his own question, "Repeat the Lord's Prayer." But apparently that was all he did; he only repeated it. So it left no deep mark on his conduct. But even the man who abuses the Lord's Prayer cannot forget it, and the remembrance is a seed that may yet fructify his barrenness.

—*So We Believe, So We Pray*, by George A. Buttrick.
Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951, p. 121.

RELIGION IN LIFE is published quarterly by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press at 75 cents per copy. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, \$5.00 for three years in the United States and possessions and Mexico; Canada, postage 18 cents per year additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents per year additional. For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E. C. 1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Publication office, 810 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tennessee. Editorial office, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York. Entered as Second Class Matter, August 26, 1942, at the post office in Nashville, Tennessee, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 16, 1923.

Critic or Apologist of Civilization?

EMIL BRUNNER

ONE OF THE REVIEWERS of my Gifford Lectures, *Christianity and Civilisation*, stated with some disappointment that "Brunner is now an apologist rather than a critic of our civilization." As this remark came to me as a complete surprise and was in itself unintelligible, I felt myself compelled to find out the reason for the underlying misunderstanding. Here is the result of my self-examination, at the same time the reason for which I believe myself to be more radically critical of our civilization than most of the acknowledged critics.

1. The criticism of a culture or civilization can be, and mostly is, one of two things: a criticism of its invisible foundations, or of its visible surface. During all my life I have been concerned much more with the first than with the second—the visible features of cultural life being, in my opinion, primarily expressions of a fundamental attitude towards life as a whole. It is because I believe that the very foundations of our civilization are shaken that I take not only a critical but a rather pessimistic view of what we are used to call "modern civilization." The obvious cultural crisis of our age is not so much the result of sociological changes, or of the technical evolution as most people believe, but the necessary outcome of an invisible underground process in modern history.

2. I do not believe that there has ever been such a thing as a "Christian civilization," if we take this word in a strict sense. But I do hold the view—in conscious opposition to Professor Latourette, who thinks the Christian influence is greater in our time than ever before—that the real cause of the cultural crisis is the rapidly growing "secularization," or to avoid this catchword, the constant decrease of religious concern and belief. My recent journey to the Far and Middle East has greatly deepened my conviction that this secularism is not only a universal, a world-wide phenomenon, but *the* most significant and far-reaching factor in determining the situation. The most serious rival of the Christian mission in Japan,

EMIL BRUNNER, D.D., LL.D., is Professor of Theology at Zurich University, Zurich, Switzerland; he has repeatedly visited and lectured in the United States. His purpose here is to show the spiritual background of the present crisis of civilization, which is the waning sense for the Holy, the Transcendent. This results in the loss of the concept of human dignity and responsibility, which ultimately must lead to a totalitarian structure of society.

in Ceylon, India, Pakistan—to name only some of the countries which I actually visited—is neither Buddhism nor Islam nor Hinduism, but secularism, i.e. the more and more complete absence of religious interest, metaphysical conceptions or transcendental orientation, the rapid waning of the third dimension, of the “depth” of life, and the subsequent transformation of life into a mere surface—this process going on in the uneducated masses as well as in the intellectual and cultural élite.

3. This is the first time in the history of mankind that the attempt is made to build a civilization on a nonreligious, secular basis. This experiment is doomed to failure. Religion—I am not speaking now exclusively of Christianity—is the depth of our existence, the root out of which the human character of life grows. Cut off from this root, all the finer forms of life, all sense of responsibility, of sacredness, of obligation, of respect and of sacrifice, as well as all real creativity, must die. Life becomes, in the ontological sense of the word, “superficial,” surface without depth, process without meaning. Man cannot understand himself any more as something different from mere nature. The absence of the Holy, of the Transcendent (whatever their religious expression may have been in the various religions), must leave life shallow, empty, and soulless.

It is this approaching entropy, this flattening of existence, this leveling-out of height and depth, this disappearance of the depth-dimension, which stand behind the much misused word “secularism.” From this angle all the higher religions stand on one side, secularism on the other. All the great religions have created their own great culture, they all have contributed the best to the common treasure of human values and produced a specifically human character of life. What soulless monstrosity civilization will be without religion, we cannot yet know, but we can guess it from what is emerging wherever religion has leaked out on a large scale.

4. The reviewer of my Gifford Lectures also expresses his disappointment that to Dr. Brunner “the real peril of our age is totalitarianism, especially Russian Communism.” I think my critic is right and wrong at the same time. The “real peril” which I see is not totalitarianism as such—terrible as it is—but, again, its invisible foundation, which is complete secularism, atheism. And totalitarianism—whether of the fascist or the communist type—is nothing else than that form of civilization and of social and political order which necessarily grows out of complete secularism or atheism. My primary concern is not totalitarianism as such, but its spiritual foundation, Godlessness; and again not so much the negation of God as the complete disinterest in anything Holy, Transcendent, Divine.

The *Leitmotiv* of my lectures is that great word of the French-Swiss philosopher, Benjamin Constant: "*de la divinité par l'humanité à la bestialité.*" His idea was the exact reverse of that of his contemporary, Auguste Comte. Whilst to Comte the process of history, starting with religion and metaphysics and proceeding towards a nonreligious, nonmetaphysical, positivistic humanism, is leading toward a beautiful end, a truly human and united humanity, this same process is seen by Constant as ending in "bestiality" as its goal. Inasmuch as the secularist movement is concerned, I cannot but subscribe to Constant's pessimistic view, and I consider the rise of totalitarianism to be the proof of his prophecy, made in 1830.

5. That is why the problem of totalitarianism, particularly in its most consistent form, that of Russian so-called Communism, looms so large in my discussion of modern civilization. If my thesis is correct that "totalitarianism is the necessary, inevitable form of civilization and of social and political order growing out of complete secularism," then the real peril for a truly human civilization is not so much the outward danger of military conquest by the Communists but the inward danger within our own democratic countries—within Switzerland, the oldest, as well as within the U. S. A., the greatest democracy of the world. The real peril is the constant progress of secularism which thus far in the West fortunately has not yet come to its logical end, totalitarianism, because it has not yet been able to discard the religious, primarily the Christian heritage.

In order to make clear my thesis about the relation between secularism and totalitarianism, let me tell an incident of my trip to the Far East. One day, just a year ago, I had to speak at Sendai University in the north of Japan, my topic being "The Spiritual Basis of Democracy." Before I stepped on the platform I was told that a few days before, some American gentlemen had lectured in the same big hall, putting forth a completely atheistic philosophy and telling their student audience that democracy had nothing whatever to do with Christianity or any religion. I could not help calling these gentlemen "ignoramuses" before the 2,000 students and professors, because they evidently had not the slightest knowledge either of the historical relations between American Christianity and the origins of American democracy, or of the philosophical connection between the Christian concept of man and a free government. I do not remember whether I merely thought or whether I openly said that these representatives of democracy were doing the same thing as a man who cuts the branch of the tree upon which he is sitting.

6. Why is this so? Why is totalitarianism the logical, necessary out-

growth of atheism or irreligion? This is so because the concepts of human dignity and human rights which are the basis of justice and freedom in any society are not by any means a matter of course, but a historical heritage which can be lost, and is lost wherever secularism or atheism becomes the accepted philosophy of life.

"The rights of man" which Thomas Jefferson formulated in his grand Declaration were neither possible nor understandable without the preceding 1800 years of Christian history. Certainly there are a good many atheists or religious indifferentists who are sincere believers in human dignity and human rights. They simply do not know that they keep and enjoy the fruits of a tree which they are cutting down with their own secularist philosophy. They live on a historical heritage, they take the interest of a historical capital, and at the same time waste away that capital. Such men—I am thinking of men like John Dewey and Bertrand Russell—try to stop short before taking the last step on that road—*de la divinité par l'humanité à la bestialité*. But once this process is on, it must go to its end, and it did so in Europe during this last generation. The ideas of human dignity and rights of men, cut off from their roots, died, and the result was the totalitarian state, that form of society and of political order which consciously ridicules such "bourgeois" ideas as freedom, personality, responsibility, rights of man. The abolition of the "antiquated" idea of human rights and the creation of the totalitarian state are one and the same thing.

7. Now, this is the tragedy of the Western world—of the United States no less than of Europe—that in our democratic countries, in our universities and secondary schools (not in all of them and not by all, but predominantly), a philosophy, a conception of man and life is taught, which in the long run will and must destroy the foundations of a free society; and that this philosophy is taught by men who personally are sincere believers in freedom and human rights, who are not conscious of cutting the roots of human freedom and justice and of preparing the way for the civilization of inhumanity, finally of totalitarianism.

I can quite believe that this analysis of our situation is more easily understood in Europe than in the United States, for the simple reason that the process of secularization has been going on much longer in Europe than in the United States. Up to 1900 America was predominantly a religious, a Christian country in which the conceptions of man and life were those of the Christian doctrine, while in Europe the devastating influence of secularism had reached a point where the rise of totalitarianism (in its two main forms) was, so to speak, natural, whereas in the United

States it still seems impossible. However, during the last decades it looks as if the tempo of radical secularization in the U. S. A. had become even faster than in most countries of western Europe. Is it not a tragedy almost beyond imagination that America is spending hundreds of millions to produce and to teach a philosophy of life which in the long run (how long?) must lead to the destruction of that "way of life" for the defense of which it spends billions?

8. Now, this is the main line of my Gifford Lectures. I leave it to the reader of this article to judge whether the argument is "rather apologetic than critical." It is true, my main concern is not the evils of what is called "capitalism," not because I do not see them or do not call them evils, but because I try to go deeper, to go beyond or behind the visible phenomena to the underlying spiritual basis. There is room for both, the one who sees the visible evil growths and the one who sees the invisible roots. But I do believe that the latter kind of criticism is entitled to be called more "radical," because it goes to the roots (*radix*).

Let me add two more remarks; one about the relation between Christianity and the other religions mentioned above, with regard to civilization. I do not think I am, as a theologian, under suspicion of religious syncretism or relativism. But I feel compelled to state as a *historical* fact, that all these great religions must be judged as main positive factors in the production of higher culture and civilization. No one who knows the history of art and of the finer forms of life in Japan can doubt that Buddhism has its great share in this sphere, that it has produced human values which are *now* in great danger of being destroyed by modern, predominantly American civilization. The same is true of Hinduism—in spite of its caste system, and of Islam—in spite of its conservatism and backwardness in many ways. It is a bad missionary habit, recognized and reprimanded by the best missionaries, to deny this fact: that all these religions have made their great contributions to the common cultural treasure of mankind.

If we ask, however, in which religion or faith reverence for the Divine and respect for human dignity are most intimately and strongly linked, the answer is not dubitable. That faith in the center of which is the God-man, the climax of which is the doctrine that God is Love, the ethics of which is summed up in the double commandment of love, love towards God and towards the fellow-man, is the surest guaranty and the most solid foundation of a truly human civilization.

The second and final point is the practical consequence of this last statement. What can we do against the "real peril" and for a truly human

civilization? We can take the gospel of Jesus Christ more seriously than ever before and do whatever we can, individually as Christians and collectively as a church, to make this gospel relevant and understandable to those who do not know or understand it yet. Whatever the forms are in which we do this primary job of the Christian church, whether old-fashioned or up to date, whether direct or indirect, whether by preaching or by teaching the cultural significance of the Christian doctrine or by its practical application to some concrete social problem, this is the one thing needful. We do not know and must not know whether we can stop the wave of secularism; but to try it with all our energy is the only thing that matters.

Religion and Education: First Principles

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

I

OUR SUBJECT MARKS the meeting point of two of the most powerful and perennial concerns of the human spirit: the *enterprise of learning*, dedicated to the quest for Truth, in the confident assurance that it is truth which sets men free; and the *heritage of religion*, declaring its possession, if not of all truth, then certainly of the ground and principle of truth.

However these two concerns—education and religion—may differ, however far apart their paths may at times appear to diverge, they confess a common allegiance to a single sovereign, Truth. If each rightly identifies that Sovereign and his command upon them, it is obvious that they should find themselves as yokemates, fellow warriors in a common battle against ignorance and error. The relations between religion and education, therefore, must always be primarily a *matter of Truth*—the liege-lord whom both profess to serve. If there be strain between education and religion, it must be, basically, because of divergent conceptions of truth, whether that divergence be overt or hidden.

To say that that relation has not always been an altogether happy one, that the association of the two undertakings, in their joint concern for the preparation of youth for life, is not always an easy and cordial partnership, is to state the obvious. From time to time, therefore, it seems appropriate to bring these two great concerns directly face to face; to examine the view of each with respect to their meeting point and common master, Truth; and thus redefine what their relationship should be.

II

But, first, it is important to note the obvious and highly important fact that religion always appears in discussions of education, as it does in the life of the community which education seeks to serve, in not one but two connections. It is this inherent *duality of religion* with respect to

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN, Ph.D., D.D., is President of Union Theological Seminary, New York City. At the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges last winter, he delivered the above address. It summarizes part of the argument of his book, *God in Education*, recently published by Scribner, the Religious Book-of-the-Month Club's choice for May, 1951.

education which is the basic source of no little of the confusion as well as the strain in the relations of these two interests.

Religion appears, in the first place, as claimant to the role of the *determinative principle in the educational process as a whole* and, therefore, entitled to affect vitally and decisively the over-all philosophy, the content and teaching of the curriculum and of its every part. This claim springs from religion's basic premise that God is the ultimate ground of truth, in relation to which every segment of knowledge and all particular truths must be oriented. This claim is simply the counterpart in the realm of learning of the wider contention that religion, since it has to do with Ultimate Reality, should permeate and direct the whole of life.

But religion appears, also, as a *quite specific interest* within the total range of interests with which the educational process is concerned, distinguishable from the other major interests of the human spirit—art, literature, philosophy, science, politics, industry, business, sport, etc.; witness the role of the churches in the life of any community. As such, it has a history and subject matter and literature of its own, and therefore claims a place within the enterprise of learning *alongside* the other principal academic disciplines.

This duality may be recognized as the distinction between *religion* and the several *Religions*. "In which of these two contexts," the religionist may be asked, "do you seek for a recognition of God in education? More specifically, in which sense do you wish religion to find a place within the university curriculum?" The answer is, "Not either-or but both-and." At first hearing, however, that sounds like an extravagant and unreasonable demand. The academic community, always somewhat jealously minded, is disposed to rejoin, "You religionists cannot have it both ways. Make up your minds whether you intend to interpret religion as, properly, the controlling factor in all life and therefore the governing principle of all knowledge; in which case give up the attempt to insert religion as a special subject with its own department in the curriculum. Or, alternatively, recognize the realities of the situation—that religion is, in fact, one among the multifarious and diverse interests of mankind, deserving of such place as it can win as a subject for special study, in which case surrender this vaulting contention that religion should penetrate and guide the whole curriculum, indeed, the entire university program." The admonition is usually implied if not explicit that the religionists would be well advised to limit their efforts to the second alternative.

It is religion in this latter reference which recently has been to the

fore in most discussions of education and religion. Doubtless, it was this aspect of the matter which sprang to mind in response to the topic of this paper. Doubtless, it was anticipated that something would be said about religious departments or courses in the curriculum, about college chapel whether required or optional, about student-sponsored religious societies, about the cultivation of religious sympathies and loyalties among faculty members.

These are large and important matters. At the proper time, they might well occupy the whole attention of such an essay as this. I shall say almost nothing about them, for one controlling reason—lest consideration of them deflect our attention from the far more fundamental and important issue on which I am eager to focus your attention—the role of religion in the over-all orientation and philosophy of education. The latter *is* the main issue, both because it is, obviously, more basic, *and* because it compels us to come to grips with education's avowed central concern and regnant loyalty—the *question of truth*. Moreover, on this issue, there should be no difference of outlook among the three major American faiths.

III

The relations of education and religion in the United States in the past is a story familiar to all.

As we all know, higher education in this country was initially almost exclusively under religious auspices. Colleges were mainly of two types. Earliest were those along the Atlantic seaboard which have since developed into the "independent" privately endowed universities—most of them founded primarily as training schools for leadership in church and government, like Harvard College, "lest New England be cursed with an illiterate ministry"!

Somewhat later in appearance were the so-called "church colleges," scattered in every corner of the land, founded by particular religious communions in order that their youth might have the privileges of the higher learning, to be furnished them in an avowedly and vigorously Christian setting.

Only at a much later period did publicly sponsored higher education attain significant proportions. Until close to the beginning of this century, prevailingly, the relation of religion to collegiate training in America was twofold. The church was the parent and sponsor of education. And religion was the keystone of the educational arch—the controlling factor in both theory and practice. That was precisely as most Americans wished.

The role of religion in the education of their children exactly mirrored the importance they intended to give religion in their own lives.

What a contrast is the situation today!

With the turn of the century, a new epoch began.

Most of the privately endowed universities have sloughed off the last vestige of ecclesiastical control. Many so-called "Christian colleges" have found themselves increasingly embarrassed and uncomfortable in their traditional church connections. Meantime, state-supported schools have so multiplied and expanded that they now harbor over half of our college youth—many of them giving no official recognition whatever to religion.

Thus has something like a revolution taken place in American higher education within two generations.

IV

We must not take time adequately to set forth the causes. They have been many. Three, all conspiring to the same end, stand forth as determinative:

The first is *rapid expansion*—in numbers of students (tenfold in forty years); in numbers of colleges and universities—to take care of this vastly increased student clientele; perhaps most influential, in numbers of academic subjects and departments—for this was the era of the most rapid extension and diversification of knowledge in human history. The larger universities multiplied schools and divisions; in some of them, it is a dull year which does not record the launching of at least one new division. The smaller colleges multiplied departments. All multiplied subjects and courses in almost every department. This development has flourished all along the line, but with most jubilant unrestraint in the so-called "practical" and vocational fields, rather than in the traditional and humanistic disciplines. Not only have the *dimensions* of the typical curriculum swollen almost beyond recognition; the traditional *balance* has altered even more drastically. No wonder religion, as a specific subject of study, has been crowded into one corner of the curriculum, if not entirely out of the main tent into an inconspicuous role as a side show.

With this expansion of subject matter and multiplication of academic divisions and departments has gone a companion development, *specialization*—concentration of attention by both teachers and students upon some one problem, or phase of a problem, to the neglect of its organic connections and larger setting. Specialization in scholarship, and a resultant

narrowing of the area of competence of each scholar; specialization in study, and a corresponding limitation of the horizons of each student. Specialization—so essential for scientific advance, so productive of increased knowledge. Specialization—so stunting to large-mindedness, so threatening to comprehension of the whole truth, that is, the *real* Truth. Specialization—which has prompted the hackneyed student jibe that a college professor is one who knows more and more about less and less; but which led Professor Whitehead to his more considered, authoritative, and devastating indictment: "The increasing departmentalization of universities during the last hundred years, however necessary for administrative purposes, tends to trivialize the mentality of the teaching profession." And, one must add, I fear—not only the mentality of those who teach, but, hardly less—by contagion and reflection—the mentality of those who are taught.

These twin features of *multiplication* and *specialization* find their most striking expression, as we would expect, in the *curriculum*, and the assumptions which underlie it. The present-day curriculum in many universities reminds one of nothing so much as a lavish cafeteria, where unnumbered tasty intellectual delicacies are strung along a moving belt for each student's choice—without benefit of dietary advice or caloric balance. "The bargain-counter theory of education," someone has called it. I have myself confronted a transcript of record from a respectable state university which testified to the student's competence, as a Bachelor of Arts, to pursue postgraduate training in philosophy and theology by the fact that he had successfully completed courses in Band, Military Science, Folk Dancing, Swimming, Animal Husbandry, and Mortuary Science. The prevailing assumption, plainly testified by the structure of the curriculum and the manner of teaching even when not openly avowed, is that knowledge consists of countless fragments of truth, spread forth higgledy-piggledy, to be savored and swallowed like so many morsels of miscellaneous intellectual pabulum. And the result in the mind of the student? All too often, obesity or mental indigestion; or, it may be, malnutrition and even pernicious intellectual anemia.

V

But multiplication and specialization have been paralleled, as both effect and cause, by a third factor, the most important of all: *progressive secularization*.

Here, what has been transpiring in education is merely a reflection, on

the whole an accurate reflection, of what has been taking place through the past half century in the life of the American people as a whole. In the progressive secularization of American education, we are hard up against the progressive secularization of American life.

With respect to the duality of religion mentioned above, it is quite clear what has actually happened in the history of American education. As we have noted, in the earliest days religion was recognized as the keystone of the educational arch, the determining factor in educational theory and practice; though the history and beliefs of Christianity also appeared as one subject, an indispensable subject, often a required subject, in the student's plan of study. In the past half century, religion has been almost universally displaced from its unique role as keystone; at the most, a department of religion has been retained, or recently reinstated, as one among the ever-multiplying disciplines of a full-orbed academic calendar. Sir Walter Moberley well describes the present situation in Great Britain:

Lately any corporate action of Christians in university affairs has tended to be sectional. It has been concerned with retaining or winning a small "place in the sun" for specifically "religious" interests. Thus Christians have striven to make good a claim for the creation of a Faculty of Theology or for the inclusion of some form of religious teaching among the options for a general degree, or to set up here and there a Hall of Residence under religious auspices as a small enclave in the middle of a secular university. Certainly such things have their value. But the main question which concerns us is quite different. It is this: "What can Christian insight contribute to enable the university to be the university?"¹

Translate two or three of the British terms into their American equivalents, and do we not have a surprisingly accurate description of our own situation?

The main point is: Just as in the curriculum, religion is no longer the keystone of the educational arch, but rather one stone among many, and a stone for which no very logical or satisfactory place within the main structure can be discovered; so, in the larger background of American educational theory and practice, religion has been slowly, for the most part quietly, and often unconsciously and unthinkingly, removed from its former place of centrality to a distinctly secondary though still important role; or, perhaps more frequently, to a peripheral and incidental status.

And this gradual but radical reorientation of education with respect to religion mirrors a corresponding change in the importance which most Americans give to religion in their own lives. If religion is today a minor

¹ Moberley, Walter, *The Crisis in the University*. The Macmillan Company, p. 26.

elective in the university curriculum, it is because religion has become in our time "an elective in the university of life"—a matter in which one may be interested if he chooses, like art or literature or aviation or golf; but in which he need feel no special interest, and to which he need acknowledge no obligation.

It is still true, as it was fifty or a hundred and fifty years ago, that the American people demand in the education of their children a place for religion comparable to that which they intend to give it in their own devotion. Our educational system has lost what had been its principle of coherence and its instrument of cohesion. Is it too much to say that the same thing is true of the national life?

VI

But enough of description and diagnosis.

We are not mainly interested in what has happened or why; but with what *should* happen, and why.

What *should be* the role of religion in education? Furthermore, we are concerned with this question as education itself would pose and face it. That means, basically, with issues of truth.

I have ventured to suggest that the present-day college curriculum might be likened to an intellectual cafeteria; and that the premise of such a curriculum (whether that premise be recognized or not) is that knowledge consists of countless fragments of truth, without pattern or unity.

But, *is* that the character of truth? Or is truth, as the older tradition assumed, an *organic whole*, each several part being what it is by virtue of its place within the whole? And, if truth *is* an organic whole—and man's knowledge an incomplete and imperfect reflection of it—*how* does it come to be so? And what does that imply for the structure and philosophy of education? We are driven hard up against the most basic question of all: against the question of the existence of God, and the bearing of the fact of God upon the principles and structure of education. The role of religion in education, rightly viewed, becomes transformed into the far deeper, and more elemental, question: "What is the relation of God, if there be a God, to Truth?"

VII

The organic unity of truth, each several part being what it is by virtue of its place within the Whole! Therefore, the coherence of knowledge, which is man's apprehension of truth. To be sure, no human mind, or all

together, ever succeed in encompassing that Whole. By the same token, no human mind rightly grasps any fragment of truth without at least a dim awareness of the Whole which gives the fragment its existence and meaning. Moreover, if truth be an organism, then every subject and every principal subdivision should suggest that unity. Any segment of knowledge which is presented without recognition of its organic relatedness to all other knowledge is being inadequately presented. It is not truth which is being set forth. And, need it be argued, that is unsound education—a betrayal of education's primary and regnant loyalty.

Obviously, this point cuts very deep indeed. What it implies is not merely the institution of courses in religion as one department in the curriculum, or required attendance on such courses. Or college chapel, whether optional or compulsory. Or a more sympathetic attitude toward one or another of the specific Religions or religion in general on the part of the faculty. What it demands is a fundamental reorientation of *every* subject in the curriculum and its presentation in every course.

Do not conjure up the bugaboo of an extreme application of this principle! It is not proposed that every lecture room be transformed into a church, and every teacher into a preacher. Nor is it for one moment suggested that scholars should be expected to give interpretations of their subjects which they do not sincerely accept as matters of their own conviction. What is most earnestly urged is that, if the premises are sound—*Truth, an Organic Unity—Knowledge, a Coherent Whole*—then, no part of knowledge, whatever its subject matter, is being fully and truly taught unless that unity of truth is assumed and, so far as is appropriate, pointed out. And that the educational institution itself which is responsible for the total setting-forth of the whole truth should consciously recognize the basic premise of its undertaking and its responsibility, and acknowledge the Divine Mind without which its enterprise could not take place.

By the same token, religion, far from being a peripheral or incidental subject in the scheme of education—one stone located haphazard here or there in the educational structure—is rightfully the central principle of education, the keystone of the educational arch—not because the churches say so, or because superstition or tradition has so imposed it upon human credulity, or because it was so recognized in one great age of learning; but because of the *nature of truth*, because, if there be a God at all, he must be the ultimate and controlling Reality through which all else derives its being; and the truth concerning him, as best man can apprehend it, must

be the keystone of the ever incomplete arch of human knowledge. Learning which does not confess him as its foundation because he is the Determiner of the conditions which make its enterprise possible, and which does not aspire to him as its goal, is false learning, however impressive its achievements and pretentious its claims.

Let us be quite clear what is at stake here. Not sentimental loyalty to religion. What is at stake is, pure and simple—an issue of Truth—of fidelity to the Sovereign which all learning acknowledges as liege-lord.

VIII

But structure is only one factor, though supposedly the most important factor, in education. What we have to face is not simply defect in curricular construction; indeed, that is important mainly as a symbol of the whole educational process. The same considerations which would return religion to a pivotal centrality in thought would restore it also to regnant centrality in all of life.

Let us be clear what is required. Not an uncritical return to ancient days and old ways. Not the slavish reproduction in this modern time of many familiar features of earlier beginnings. Not the rejection or loss of a single sound achievement of recent decades. What is required is something at once far more fundamental and far more embracing—the recovery of the inherent principles which guided and empowered “the great tradition.” More specifically, the reaffirmation of the organic unity of truth, and therefore of true knowledge; of the interrelatedness and interdependence of the individual and society, of man and nature, of the world and God, of this life and the life beyond; above all, the restoration of religion to a position of necessary and unchallenged centrality; and the acknowledgment of the reality and regnancy of the Living God as the foundation of both learning and life.

Is a "Christian Foreign Policy" Possible?

FRED W. RIGGS

IT IS NATURAL for us to think, or at least to hope, that our culture should give corporate expression to our Christian faith and that in its international behavior our government should bear witness to the religious convictions of its citizens. Yet it is patent that both our materialistic civilization and our foreign policy fall far short of the ideals which Christians proclaim.

On deeper reflection, however, one may well ask whether there is not a basic incompatibility between the "Christian" universalistic ideals and the conduct of relations between parochial, sovereign states in which the ultimate sanction always appears to be resort to the test of force, not of right. Indeed, the behavior of a state exhibits on a collective level the same self-righteousness, egoism, and sin that the individual displays on the personal level. The state too must come under the judgment of God and must look for its final justification to the Divine mercy.

Yet the necessity of making ethical choices in a real world always confronts the individual. It also confronts the sovereign state. A Christian, facing the urgent and tragic dilemmas of our time, ceaselessly reminds himself to seek not "my will" but "Thy will." Similarly in the larger world, on the level of international rivalry and conflict, his prime loyalty must be not to "my country" but to the Kingdom of God.

But the practical statesman, however much he may uphold perfectionist ideals, knows that in the real and complex world every achievable course of action implies compromise, inequity, and sin. He cannot even retain his post of public trust, involving as it does responsibility to his immediate constituents, his compatriots and his colleagues, unless he makes the public and national interest his first objective. Until a global, democratic state has been achieved, therefore, the leaders of sovereign nations must of necessity give priority to parochial rather than universal concerns.

Within these existential limitations, however, Christian statesmanship

FRED W. RIGGS, Ph.D., is a Research Associate of the Foreign Policy Association, New York City. Born in China of missionary parents, he has combined an active interest in the Christian enterprise (S. C. M. and S. V. M., etc.) with his writing and teaching (City College, New York, and elsewhere) in the field of political science.

requires that the proximate and practicable be continuously tested against the ideal. In particular, those responsible for foreign policy may interpret their duties in the widest possible context. Certainly that which, in the long run, promotes world peace, security, and justice likewise furthers the national interest. They can eschew narrowly conceived and short-sighted interpretations of national interest which may prove both self-defeating and immoral. The statesman differs from the mere politician in taking a far higher view of national interest and in being ready to struggle for it against popular apathy and misunderstanding. But the would-be statesman whose perfectionist vision ranges so far beyond the practicable that he cannot implement his objectives may, more than a less idealistic politician, lead his country into confusion and folly. This may well be the judgment of history on the career, for example, of President Woodrow Wilson.

The Christian citizen, as he surveys the problems of public and foreign policy, may similarly choose between advocating absolutist ideals and making hard choices among distasteful alternatives. The absolutist certainly has a function in pricking the conscience of other men. If he is true to his absolutism, it may be expected to lead to his crucifixion. He must also realize that his ideals may not be achieved when applied to real dilemmas, and are of little avail to provide the basis for making specific, responsible decisions on public policy. The Christian who seeks to apply his faith to the realities of our world, therefore, must often choose the lesser of several evils or work for the achievement of proximate goals, of partial justice, relative order and imperfect peace.

If there can be a "Christian foreign policy," it must mean that statesmen, however imperfectly, strive toward certain ideals in their day-to-day decisions and that Christian citizens seek to interpret their faith realistically and responsibly.

I

A major tragedy in American life has been our failure to effect a meaningful juxtaposition of the practicable and the ideal in our foreign policy. The very fact that distance, British naval supremacy, the existence of a power balance in Europe, and the lack of a strong rival in the Western hemisphere enabled us to evolve our national life in relative isolation up to the outbreak of the First World War, enabled us to accept the hypocritical myth that the "American way" somehow made it possible for us to live on a higher moral plane than the nations who were more intimately involved in the sordid interplay of power rivalries. Although we entered

the First World War chiefly to counteract a disturbance of the balance of power caused by the expansionist policy of Germany and the risk of French and British defeat, the decision was "sold" to the American public primarily in terms of great ideals: a "war to end war" and to "make the world safe for democracy." But these ideals failed to provide adequate guidance for the problems of making peace. The failure to implement many of the high-sounding promises has proved costly to American interests and to the cause of world understanding. The numerous concessions and compromises dictated by previous commitments among European powers, although finally accepted by President Wilson, were widely regarded as moral betrayals. But the treatment of Germany, instead of being informed by a realistic understanding of the necessity of creating a strong but stable and nonimperialistic country in central Europe, was motivated by a vindictive desire to punish and weaken, which laid the groundwork for the Second World War.

Inside the United States a similar moralistic abstractness obstructed a realistic policy regarding the League of Nations. On the one side President Wilson demanded a universal collective security system which the real League could never have provided, while the isolationists who triumphed in the twenties hoped, by striking an attitude, to avoid entanglement in Europe's sordid struggles. Neither side grappled with the problem of forming a stable balance of power which, at the time, was the only achievable means for keeping the peace.

Recognition of the inadequacies of such a moralistic approach to world problems has brought a reaction in this country with the awakening of interest in the realities of power politics. In the intellectual sphere this tendency has been formulated by such men as Nicholas Spykman in *America's Strategy in World Politics: The United States and the Balance of Power*; Hans Morgenthau in *Politics Among Nations*; and Walter Lippmann in *U.S. Foreign Policy* and *U.S. War Aims*. In the political sphere it has manifested itself in a growing emphasis, first on economic, then on military measures to build "situations of strength" which might counteract the expansion of Soviet Russian power.

II

But this surely is to go too far toward a neo-Machiavellianism—for the world is composed not only of parochial states locked in a perpetual struggle for security and power, but also of human beings whose demands for a livelihood, for justice, freedom, and dignity also make up part of the

stuff of world politics. Even national strength cannot be built without considering what the military men call "morale," a factor as important among the peasants of India or China as among our own citizens. General Dwight D. Eisenhower emphasized this in his address to Congress on February first when he said, "One of the greatest factors in this whole thing is morale," which, he added, "involves understanding, it involves heart, it involves courage, fortitude, basic purpose."

No foreign policy can hope to gain the support of millions of plain people which does not champion moral aims. The foundations of national power rest as much on the resources of the spirit as on forces of matter. Americans must remember that, despite the pre-eminence of two mammoth states, there are millions of people not only in Asia and Africa, but also in the European heart of Western civilization, who are without firm allegiance and have refused so far to align themselves solidly with either superpower. If they are not to turn to communism, or at best submit in apathy and despair to the first police state that overruns them, they must see a basis for hope in our leadership.

In one of the most stirring declarations of recent times, Dr. Charles Malik, Lebanon's delegate to the United Nations, told a General Assembly committee, "The challenge of the moment is whether modern man, distracted and overwhelmed by himself and by the world, can still regain the original integrity of his soul. . . . Man thirsts after ideas. If the habits and institutions of the West are not adapted for the production of a ringing message, full of content and truth, satisfying the mind, appealing to the heart, firing the will, a message on which one can stake his whole life, then in the present world . . . the West cannot lead. Leadership must pass on to others, no matter how perverted and false these others might be. . . . The only effective answer to Communism is a genuine spiritualized materialism which seeks to remove every trace of social injustice without loss of the higher values which constitute the very soul of the West."¹

Our government's leaders acknowledge the importance of these spiritual factors. In his address to the National Conference of Jews and Christians on November 9, 1950, Secretary of State Dean Acheson condemned the view that "the ultimate reality in international relations is to be found only in terms of power, whether military or economic." He stressed the importance of "powerful intangibles which are an essential part of the reality of international relations. Foremost among these is the moral and spiritual factor in human life." Similarly President Truman in his State

¹ Statement on November 23, 1949, Committee 1, General Assembly.

of the Union address on January 8 declared, "Our common ideals are a great part of our strength. These ideals are the driving force of human progress. The free nations believe in the dignity and worth of man."

In a similar vein Senator Brien MacMahon told the Senate on January 22 that "the massive danger now confronting our nation stems primarily from our failure to recognize the sword of the spirit as the only absolute weapon. . . . We must demonstrate that we are willing to do our share and more in bringing about . . . a fraternity of mankind—and that we have a program that can lead men toward the final enshrinement of human brotherhood." The needs of the Orient, he said, "are not only material but of the spirit," they seek "the freedom and the equality that for so many generations men of the West have denied to their brothers . . . in India, in China, in Africa."

III

A glance at the actualities of our recent foreign policy, however, leads one to question whether these declarations of principle do not represent a pious wish or lifeless residue, carried over from an earlier day without compelling force at the present time. In theory, a more profoundly ethical impetus in our foreign policy would improve our ability to defend and uphold long-range American national interests. Conversely, a policy better calculated to further our national interest might also approximate more nearly to the ideal standards of our Christian faith. Alas, many aspects of our recent record seem to be inspired neither by high religious conviction nor by enlightened self-interest!

A quick survey of some military and economic policies intended to strengthen our national position may illustrate this proposition. In the military sphere, for example, we are attempting to construct, under the leadership of General Eisenhower, a unified Western defense force. It has been intended that one important component of that force should consist of re-armed Germans. The United States took the lead last September in obtaining a verbal accord—despite obvious French and British reluctance—on German participation in European defense. The agreement proved merely verbal, however, as it has since become clear that the Germans will refuse to rearm except on their own terms. But these terms could well return the country to the control of ultranationalist army officers and the industrial leaders of the Ruhr. Moreover, it would certainly be accompanied by strong pressure for German unification, to say nothing of a highly explosive campaign for the recovery of Germany's lost provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line. Such a development would also strengthen the

Soviet position inside the Eastern European satellite countries, and quite probably would precipitate Russian military intervention as a preventive measure. Perhaps most significant of all, the prospects of a revived authoritarianism in Germany and of Soviet retaliation would accelerate defeatism and "neutralism" in France, thereby greatly diminishing the prospects of French unity in the defense of their country, to say nothing of undermining French willingness to fight for Western Europe as a whole.

Adverse results have already followed from the preliminary decisions on German rearmament. Last September's announcement offered the Russians a weighty propaganda weapon to confuse public opinion in independent countries, to frighten their satellites into more monolithic obedience, and to build up popular support for war at home. But the decision also created misunderstanding and resentment in the minds of our British and French allies, and has strengthened the opposition groups within those two countries who not only criticize the decision on Germany but are increasingly attacking their governments for their allegedly spineless acceptance of Washington's initiatives. The modification of our German policy reflected in General Eisenhower's report on his European trip constituted a tardy recognition of important moral considerations which should have been apparent in the summer of 1950 when the dangerous decisions on Germany were taken. The temptation to regard countries and peoples as military bastions and potential armies, without adequate consideration of the interests and outlook of the human beings involved, continues to weaken rather than strengthen our own defense position.

IV

Turning to a predominantly economic policy—the program for technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, Point Four—it is apparent that a similar fatality dogs measures put forward with philanthropic optimism. The great hopes aroused in Asia by President Truman's 1949 inaugural address have been painfully deflated by the puny appropriations—\$35 millions, compared with billions for other types of aid—which finally passed Congress.

This disappointment, however, was as nothing compared with the disillusionment that will almost certainly follow the application of even a much larger program. Technical assistance could actually do little, for some time, to increase the total production of consumer goods. Whatever small increment there might be would be quickly used up: first, by expanding populations as public health measures begin to reduce traditional causes

of high death rates; and second, through the grasping practices of privileged minorities in each country. Even should greatly increased production be miraculously achieved, the psychological results would not be those of our sanguine hopes. As illiterate, poverty-stricken peasants learn to read and become aware of the glittering material advantages enjoyed by other nations or by their own more privileged neighbors, their former impotent frustration and despair will be transmuted into revolutionary anger. Without disparaging the importance—nay, the indispensability—of programs intended to alleviate poverty and physical suffering, it should be clearly understood that any purely economic program dedicated solely to material improvement is likely to make us more enemies than friends.

V

If moral confusions have tended to frustrate our military and economic policies, the same may be said even more strongly about our political attitudes toward the peoples of Asia. In Asia, indeed, the decisive importance of spiritual leadership is particularly apparent because of the extent to which indigenous religious institutions that once held together the disparate populations have largely withered away. The situation in Europe or Africa could be characterized in somewhat similar terms.

The internal decay of traditional institutions has been reinforced by the corroding impact of our Western industrial market society, disintegrating in each case the local foundations of community and social order. The purely material values of the market—the insatiable quest for material goods for their own sake—have become the dominant social influence. It is only natural, therefore, that native spokesmen should place great stress on raising living standards and that we should be led to base our policy on this imperious demand.

Characteristically the most dynamic movements in Asia fall into two categories. First, there are those which look to the past, seeking to restore some ancient religious basis for social integration. Such are the fanatical Muslim and Hindu sects of India and the Middle East, State Shintoism in Japan, or the nineteenth-century Slavophil movement in Russia. Second, there are movements which seek to speed the process of Westernization. They tend to focus on opposition to those who are thought to stand in the way of progress. This tendency is revealed in nationalist movements directed against foreign colonial masters or against a dominant native race, and in demands for social reform to eliminate the power of ruling minorities—usually a landlord class, a bureaucracy, an industrial or commercial

oligarchy. Except in Japan where the reactionary and nationalist trends united in support of the Emperor institution, the religious revivers appear to have failed and the nationalists and socialists to have triumphed.

The strength of communism in Asia is due primarily to its ability to capture for its own purposes these basic social forces, rather than to any real capacity to improve living standards as a whole—although existing wealth may be redistributed—or to any employment of military force projected from the Russian heartland. Having gained power, as in China, the Communists utilize every technique of the police state to consolidate their rule; but it would be a dangerous oversimplification to overlook the fact that they also provide a new ideological basis for the integration of the individual into a functioning society, and for the efficient utilization of human energies and abilities which were otherwise often wasted or directed toward destructive and mutually antagonistic purposes.

By contrast to the Communists, the United States, despite lip service to the ideal of national independence, has, with the important exception of the Philippines, given the impression of opposing nationalism. Whether justly or not, this is the widespread conviction of native leaders in India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, Indo-China, Malaya, and the Arab countries of the Middle East.

The reasons for this American policy are complex, but roughly stated, they include our desire for close relations with the European colonial countries—Britain, France and the Netherlands—which clashes with our professed wish to aid the cause of independence. They include such contradictory objectives as the desire to safeguard Middle Eastern oil and military interests and at the same time to support political Zionism. Most important, however, they have developed from a compulsion to strengthen anti-Communist regimes at any price. Not trusting Asian leaders and institutions to maintain their national independence of Russia, we appear to have thought that only perpetuation of imperial authority or firm commitments to an anti-Soviet front would frustrate the agents of Moscow. As a matter of fact, however, these contradictory policies played into the hands of Communist-led revolutionary movements and weakened the domestic support of those governments which were friendly to or dependent on the United States.

The American attitude toward social reform is even more disastrous than the record on nationalist movements. Without intending to uphold reactionary regimes, the United States has in actual practice, by supporting existing governments and anti-Communist groups, associated itself with

the most corrupt and oppressive regimes in Asia, regimes symbolized by the names of Chiang Kai-shek, Bao Dai, Syngman Rhee, and Pibul Songgram. The fact that some of these men in the past had been popular heroes in the struggle for national independence should not have blinded us to the fact that their identification with the interests of a native privileged minority made them incapable of leading the equally basic movements for social reform.

A momentous decision to insist on reform as a precondition of material assistance was heralded by the Bell mission report on the Philippines; but it remains to be seen whether American supervision by the Economic Cooperation Administration can compel the Quirino administration in Manila to carry out the vitally needed changes necessary if the confidence of the Filipino people is to be recaptured.

VI

The American position in Asia has been further undermined by the attitude of superiority revealed by many Americans abroad, the Asiatic immigration restrictions of the United States, and racial discriminations practiced at home—all of which discredit our equalitarian pretensions and make them appear crudely hypocritical to the Asian observer. Since one of the most potent ideas in the social turmoil of Asia has become the doctrine of equality, Asian leaders are hypersensitive to every sign that Americans look down on people with dark complexions. The drive behind many a nationalist agitator may be traced to some humiliating personal contact with Europeans or Americans. The relatively inconspicuous role of Russian "advisers" and "experts" in Asian countries (although recent reports stress the increasingly offensive behavior of growing numbers of Russians in China), the active leadership of Communist movements by native personnel, and the reportedly equalitarian treatment of racial minorities inside the Soviet Union have raised Russia's stock in Asia.

Racial pride, however, has been but one aspect of America's self-righteousness which has been a prime factor in corrupting the most sincere efforts to improve relations between East and West. When Ambassador Warren Austin in a speech before the Security Council on November 28, 1950, cited Christian institutions in China as evidence of Sino-American friendship, he touched off a wave of protest demonstrations in China, characterized by such statements as "American imperialists always use religion as a tool in their aggression and term it 'friendship.'" Although sponsored by the Communists for obvious political purposes, the campaign met with

a response. Apparently it must have released some deeply hidden well-spring of resentment.

The generosity of the Point Four offer is tinged with the conceit that American technology can provide all the answers to age-old human problems. Our very terminology, replete with such insulting terms as "backward peoples," or with words rendered odious by usage, such as "Asiatic," "Chinaman," "Oriental," to say nothing of "chink" or "jap" or "gook," reveals a bias which is deeply resented by Asian leaders. Proud of their own ancient cultures, they are likely, even when most actively engaged in westernizing themselves, to point with scorn at every moral and cultural shortcoming in American or European life.

In this connection the reports of the incorruptibility of the Chinese Communists have been tremendously influential throughout Asia, where one of the most acute social evils is the venality of bureaucratic ruling groups, a venality which has flourished both in independent native states and in dependent territories. Yet the regimes which the United States, with all its moralistic pretensions, has actually supported have been among the most corrupt. American material aid has not only been diverted into the pockets of dishonest bureaucrats, but it has also enabled governments to postpone carrying out vitally needed reforms. It is scarcely to be wondered at that in many parts of Asia the American government is considered the friend of corruption and reaction, and our high-sounding propaganda is taken as evidence of insincerity and hypocrisy.

VII

The failure to elaborate and bear consistent witness to a positive and coherent faith lies at the very root of the American failure, especially in its dealings with Asia. In his November 9 address, Secretary Acheson sought to formulate a minimum democratic credo by affirming "the essential worth of the individual, the freedom that is essential to his growth, and the conception that men shall be brothers unto each other."

Unfortunately these minimum beliefs can be differently construed to justify the most diverse social systems. The "essential worth of the individual" may be used either to fortify the most extreme defense of property institutions or to uphold widespread confiscations so that every individual may share in the common wealth. The concept of freedom may be used to strengthen the special privileges of those who own and rule, or to rationalize the desire of the exploited to overthrow their oppressors. Because of these ambiguities, American democratic principles have been twisted so as

to justify almost every type of social order, even the most unjust and tyrannical, provided it proclaimed its hostility to communism or to Soviet imperialism.

One of the most powerful appeals of communism in Asia is precisely its highly elaborated ideology. A major feature noted by reports from Communist China is the prevalence of compulsory "study" groups in which everyone—at least every educated person—must learn the new doctrines, and make personal confession of past "sins" under the old order, publicly affirming his determination to live a new life on a higher moral plane. An article by a recent resident of China, in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* of December 7, declares that Chinese Communists lead a "dedicated life like that of a monk. Communists are noted for their simplicity and austerity." The author goes on to describe the intensive self-criticism and consecration to collective aims which Chinese Communists display.

In striking contrast, the people of the Western nations appear confused and lethargic as to their ultimate goals—while their chief apologists, in speaking of the "free" peoples, fail to distinguish between the concepts of civil liberties, "free enterprise," and independence of Russian imperialism, as though the three ideas were synonymous. The menace of communism and Soviet imperialism appears to have so hypnotized many of our leaders that their total thinking and strategy have been polarized and diverted into negativistic lines. As a result, any group which seeks to stand apart from the major power struggle is suspected of being pro-Soviet, and anyone who opposes Russia, no matter how sinister and reactionary, is welcomed as a supporter of "freedom." There appears to be little hope for escape from this fatal fascination unless we can once more seize the leadership in a struggle for a positively conceived way of life.

VIII

But the apologists of the secular, democratic way of life have not produced a capable band of dedicated missionaries, or even a consistent formulation of their basic convictions which could provide such a positive guide to American foreign policy. This weakness does not arise primarily from the imprecise application to the contemporary international situation of such doctrines as the "essential worth of man," but from a basic inadequacy in the doctrine itself. One may plausibly argue that the most extreme form of Communist totalitarianism traces its roots historically to this very doctrine. Does it not underlie the French revolutionary vision of a perfect, secular, equalitarian society in whose name the first modern "reign of terror"

was instituted? And once the doctrines of sin and of Divine judgment have been replaced by pure rationalism, or by dialectical materialism,—is not the way paved for any unchecked benevolent despotism with absolutist pretensions to seek to impose by force a completely equalitarian society in which the elimination of private property and "wage slavery" will create the conditions for universal freedom? But isn't this utopian and unrealistic apotheosis of "man" the basis not only of Stalinism's perfectionist delusions, but also of our proud conceit that American national and technical culture can bring material salvation to the "great unwashed"?

If the secularists cannot provide an adequate ideological basis for American leadership at a time when great responsibility has been thrust upon us, can the church meet the challenge by reaffirming the basic insights that undergird historic Christendom? Can there be, in other words, any basis for a Christian foreign policy in America? In thinking about this challenge the Christian must face certain basic realities. He must remember that in a pluralistic and secularistic culture such as ours has become, the voice of the church speaks as the voice of a minority or a pressure group, not as the conscience of the society as a whole. He must remember too that no matter how much the state may elevate its moral standards and leadership, it still remains a parochial state and not a universal order—"my country" can never become the Kingdom of God. The Christian must also look hard at the institutional churches, at the multitude of rival sects, many of which have gone so far down the road of humanistic secularism on the one hand, or of otherworldliness on the other, that they seem to have lost the ability to proclaim a gospel profoundly relevant for our times.

Within these limitations, it would seem that we have a duty to seek to translate Christian insights and convictions into political action so that the United States government may react, in this hour of profound trial, with the sort of creativity that may contribute toward peace and justice, rather than war and injustice, on the earth. We have a duty also to direct our private international activities—the missionary enterprise, the secular philanthropies, the commercial and cultural ventures—into channels that will strengthen the bases of a world Christian order.

But neither the personal effort nor the governmental policy can have much hope of bringing about real reconciliation unless it begins in a mood of penitence and confession, of love and good will. So long as our individual and corporate behavior continues to be informed by an arrogant self-righteousness, it is hard to believe that we are not rapidly moving down the highway to disaster, to the awful revelation of the Wrath of God.

Phillips Brooks and the Incarnation

FRANCIS GERALD ENSLEY

IN THE SPRING OF 1874 Principal John Tulloch of St. Marys College, Aberdeen, was visiting Boston, Massachusetts. He had been received with "flattering kindness" by Boston's great,—Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Richard Dana. On Sunday, April 26, he attended the services of Trinity Episcopal Church and wrote immediately after to his wife:¹

I have just heard the most remarkable sermon I have ever heard in my life (I use the word in no American sense) from Mr. Phillips Brooks, an Episcopal clergyman here; equal to the best of Frederick Robertson's sermons, with a vigor and force of thought which he has not always. I never heard preaching like it, and you know how slow I am to praise preachers. So much thought and so much life combined; such a reach of mind, such a depth and insight of soul. I was electrified. I could have got up and shouted.

The effect Phillips Brooks produced on the distinguished Scotch theologian is not an isolated phenomenon. This testimony as to his power is corroborated by many witnesses. James Bryce once wrote that in Brooks's blending of "perfect simplicity of treatment with singular fertility and elevation of thought" no preacher of his generation approached him.² Charles Eliot called his prayer at the Commemoration Day exercises for Harvard's dead on July 21, 1865, "the most impressive utterance of a proud and happy day," even surpassing in its effect upon its hearers Lowell's famous "Commemoration Ode."³ George A. Gordon, his colleague across Copley Square at Old South Church, concedes him to be the greatest of all American inspirational preachers.⁴ Dean Charles R. Brown of Yale, both an exemplar and judge of pulpit excellence, who in his student days had heard Brooks every Sunday, pronounces it "wonderful preaching—I can feel the tingle and inspiration of it yet, though it is thirty-eight years since he died."⁵ Even the very acid man of letters, Barrett Wendell, having no

¹ Oliphant, *Life of Principal Tulloch*, 292.

² *Westminster Gazette*, February 6, 1893. Quoted in *Dictionary of American Biography*, III, 87.

³ Cf. Allen, A. V. G., *Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1900, I, 552.

⁴ Gordon, G. A., *My Education and Religion*. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925, p. 301.

⁵ Brown, C. R., *My Own Yesterdays*. Century Co., 1931, p. 50.

FRANCIS GERALD ENSLEY, Ph.D., D.D., is pastor of the North Broadway Methodist Church, Columbus, Ohio. The article is an attempt to expound the central concept and leading motive of America's greatest preacher.

bias toward religion, could write a memorable letter at the time of Brooks's passing, describing him as "a great poetic religious enthusiast," whose "death affected the city in a way I have never seen anything do before. You felt in every corner of the town that something serious had happened. . . . Even the morally vulgar felt as much as anyone there had been a great public loss."⁶

What was the secret? What was it that "electrified" not only the learned like Principal Tulloch but called forth comparable enthusiasm in a man of affairs like Ambassador Bryce, a steely Unitarian such as Eliot, the sophisticated Wendell, fellow preachers and religionists, not to mention "the morally vulgar"?

When Brooks himself came to analyze his secret (not consciously, of course, but actually) in his famous *Lectures on Preaching*, he said there were two elements: truth and personality.⁷ (Significantly, Tulloch names the same two: "so much thought and so much life combined; such a reach of mind, and such a depth and insight of soul.") Preaching is the communication of truth through the personality of the preacher to his brother men.

Much has been written on the second element, Brooks's personality: the majestic stature, the beautiful face with its deep, luminous eyes, the impetuous utterance, the noble character incapable of meanness, the human sympathy as deep and wide as the ocean at his door, the abiding faith in God and values eternal. Not so much has been said about the truth which he proclaimed. What was it?

Professor A. V. G. Allen, who qualifies as a theologian as well as a chronicler, says in his monumental biography of Brooks that "his leading motive and the ground principle of his theology and his life" was the Incarnation.⁸

Over the mystery of the Incarnation Phillips Brooks was perpetually brooding, till it became to him what the doctrine of the "divine sovereignty" had been to his Puritan ancestors. He struggled with all the forms of literary art in order to seize an expression of it in his sermons, adequate to convey the fullness of the reality, as he grasped it, to his hearers.

To be sure, it was not the subject of every sermon: like all preachers he had many themes. But it was the silent presupposition of every message. It was the hub about which his preaching turned, or, to employ a figure of Brooks's own choosing, as a motive it stands to the other motives as "the

⁶ Howe, M. A. DeW., *Barrett Wendell and His Letters*. Atlantic Monthly Press, 1924, p. 107.

⁷ Brooks, P., *Lectures on Preaching*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1877, p. 5.

⁸ Allen, *op. cit.*, II, 517, 519.

staff officers stand around a general. He made them. They execute his commands. He could not do his work without them. But he is not dependant upon them as they are upon him; anyone of them might fall away and he could still fight the battle. The power of the battle is in him. If he falls, the cause is ruined."⁹

Let us examine this belief about which Brooks's preaching turned.

I

The Incarnation is, first of all, a doctrine about Jesus Christ: that in him divinity and humanity were united, or, as the New Testament phrases it, "God was in Christ." And, secondly, by implication, it is a doctrine about God: that he is Christlike. He is a personal being, for only such can explain the intelligence, conscience, sense of duty, and God-consciousness that dwelt in Jesus. He is near, immanent, available to his creation. He is good, as Christ was good, with a benevolent, redemptive love toward all his children.

In all this Phillips Brooks heartily concurred. To be sure, there was often a certain vagueness in his presentation, as with most modern Christology. The fine distinctions of Athanasius and the Nicene Council are not loved by men of these later times. Yet, Allen is probably within the truth when he affirms that, "since the days of Athanasius there has been no one who has held the doctrine of the person of Christ in the spirit of Athanasius more firmly than he."¹⁰ So far as his thought about God is concerned he was an undeviating Christian theist. The Incarnation reveals personality as well as "setting in living presence the holiness and love of God."¹¹

The unique fact, however, about Brooks's interpretation of the Incarnation is that he construed it as a *doctrine about man*. He never questioned the union of divinity and humanity in Jesus Christ. But, also, he never looked upon it as an isolated historical fact. Rather, he regarded Christ's Incarnation as a specification of a universal principle that holds in all life. What he found in Jesus Christ he generalized. If the Incarnation portrays the actual humanity of God—as the older theology maintained—it equally proclaims the potential divinity of man. If Jesus Christ is a revelation of what God is, he is also a sign of what man may become.

The doctrine declares, he contended, "the vast capacity of man" for

⁹ *Lectures on Preaching*, pp. 257-258.

¹⁰ Allen, *op. cit.*, II, 841.

¹¹ From his sermon upon his return to Boston, September, 1883. Quoted in Allen, II, 444.

receiving and revealing God.¹² "The great truth of the Incarnation" is "that a perfectly pure obedient humanity might utter divinity, might be the transparent medium through which even God might show himself."¹³ "It is because the divine can dwell in us that we may have access to divinity."¹⁴ "God *did* become man, and therefore manhood must be essentially capacious of divinity."¹⁵ "He who sees God in Christ sees also himself, and learns his own capacities as he receives the God whom Christ makes known to him."¹⁶ The Incarnation is at heart a doctrine about human potentiality, a confirmation of human hopes.

For the union of God and man could not have taken place in Jesus Christ had there not been an affinity between humanity and the Highest. They belong to each other. "God and man are essentially so near together that the meeting of their natures in the life of a God-man is not strange." . . . "It was not necessary to deny his divinity in order to give him the human prerogatives, nor to overlook his humanity in order to see and feel the divine."¹⁷ Nowhere does Brooks give more eloquent expression to the essential kinship of God and man than in his famous sermon from Proverbs, "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord."¹⁸ Seizing the metaphor of his text he points out that a candle gives light only because there is a correspondence between it and the flame. If you try to burn granite it refuses to give the fire a chance to show its brightness. It may glow with sullen resistance and as the heat increases, split and break, but it will not yield. The candle, however, with its affinity for the flame presents a point of permanent and clear expression. So the spirit of man, because of its natural affinity for God, is capable of divinity.

Only to believe in this is an adequate faith.

To believe in the sun and not in the eye; to believe in the sweetness of the honey and not in the power of taste; to believe in the God over us and around us and not in the God within us—that would be a powerless and fruitless faith. But to believe in God the Son and God the Spirit too, in the divine capacity within us answering back to the divine offer around us; to believe in ourselves through the divine presence which we are capable of receiving and containing—that completes the faith of man.¹⁹

Before we write off Brooks's thought about man as insolvent nineteenth-

¹² *Ibid.*, 447.

¹³ From his sermon at the annual convention of the Episcopal Church in Massachusetts, May 14, 1880. Quoted, Allen, II, 245.

¹⁴ *The Purpose and Use of Comfort*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1878, p. 241.

¹⁵ *Sermons for Principal Festivals and Fasts of the Church Year*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1895, p. 27.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 331.

¹⁷ From an unpublished manuscript sermon, and see Allen, *op. cit.*, II, 521.

¹⁸ Cf. *The Candle of the Lord*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1881, pp. 1-21.

¹⁹ *Sermons for Principal Festivals and Fasts of the Church Year*, p. 332.

century optimism, we need to recall two facts: In the first place, he is speaking not about man as we find him, but man as, under the inspiration of Christ, he can be. Brooks never taught the mawkish notion that man is irrevocably good, that there is a spark of God in every soul, etc. As a parish minister he knew only too well that the flame can go out! But he knew also as a pastor, what our allegedly realistic generation has forgotten or never seen, that men, even the worst specimens, can be lighted again! Brooks maintains in his *Lectures on Preaching* that so many of our troubles "come from our having too high an estimate of men's present condition and too low an estimate of their possibility."²⁰ Perhaps if he were phrasing it now he would say that under the joint impact of mechanistic modes of thought and massive evils, we have taken too rigid a view of men's present condition and too pessimistic a view of their possibility. The Incarnation for Phillips Brooks was not a symbol of man *in esse* but *in posse*.

In the second place, before we dismiss the theory under consideration as namby-pamby, we should remember that Brooks always conceived of it as morally conditioned and authenticated. The union of divine and human is not a merging of metaphysical stuffs but a harmonizing of wills. Concerning Christ, "of no act that the strong gentle hands can do can we say anything but this, that Father and Son together do it, making one power, working one result."²¹ "God's will and Christ's obedience! Here then there is the perfect naturalness, the absolute understanding and harmony of the Father and the Son."²² And the sign of whether—and the degree to which—incarnation has taken place in any life is, likewise, "a deepened and extended morality." Speaking on "The Healthy Conditions of a Change of Faith," he urges that every new religious truth must meet the ethical test:²³

Can you make men brave instead of cowardly, kind instead of cruel, true instead of false? For every new form of religious thinking it is a blessed thing that, full of its first fresh enthusiasm, it is compelled to pass along the road where the old solemn judges sit who have judged all the ages, the judges before whose searching gaze many an ardent young opinion has withered away and known its worthlessness, the judges who ask of every comer the same unchanging question, "Can you make men better men?"

Now Brooks draws four corollaries from his concept of the Incarnation.

I. *It makes fellowship with God possible.* It is a sound principle of

²⁰ *Lectures on Preaching*, p. 81.

²¹ Baccalaureate sermon, Harvard University, 1884. Quoted, Allen, II, 545.

²² *Visions and Tasks*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1886, p. 291.

²³ *Essays and Addresses*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1894, p. 545.

epistemology that knowledge can be effected only if there is a fundamental affinity between thought and its object. So our knowledge of God depends on a common ground between man and his Creator. The Incarnation makes possible, further, not only a knowledge of God through his effects, such as natural theology presents us. It gives us God himself. He is experienced as "A power *in* man, not simply a power over man,"²⁴ a Presence trying to press knowledge of itself upon man, to comfort even when we are unaware, to soften, to elevate, and to purify.²⁵

2. *It makes the Christian way of life natural.* We might think in advance of the event that the coming of God into human life

must be something very terrible and awful, that certainly must render, rend and tear the life to which God comes. At least it will separate it and make it unnatural and strange. God fills a bush with his glory, and it burns. God enters into the great mountain, and it rocks with earthquake. When he comes to occupy a man, he must distract the humanity which he occupies into some unhuman shape.²⁶

Actually, the Advent took place with miraculous simplicity and quietness, as Brooks put it in his immortal carol,

How silently, how silently,
The wondrous gift is given
So God imparts to human hearts
The blessings of his heaven.
No ear may hear his coming,
But in this world of sin,
Where meek souls will receive him still,
The dear Christ enters in.

So the new life in Christ—the Incarnation in the large—is "the most quietly common naturally human life that was ever seen upon the earth."²⁷ It is

not something strange and foreign, brought from far away. It is the deepest possibility of man, revealed and made actual. When you stand at last complete in Christ, it is not some rare adornments which he has lent from his Divinity to clothe your humanity with. These graces are the signs of your humanity. They are the flower of your human life, drawn out into luxuriance by the sunlight of the divine love.²⁸

In summary, "*the Christian is nothing but the true man.*"²⁹

3. Obviously, the Incarnation enforces reverence for human personality. "The first secret of all effective and happy living," Brooks told the

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 383.

²⁵ See the sermon, "The Nearness of God," *Seeking Life*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1904, pp. 37-56.

²⁶ Unpublished manuscript sermon, quoted, Allen, II, 521.

²⁷ *Loc. cit.*

²⁸ *Seeking Life*, p. 56.

²⁹ *The Light of the World*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1890, p. 8.

graduating class at Harvard in 1884, "is in a true reverence for the mystery and greatness of your human nature, for the things which you and your brethren are, in simply being men."³⁰ And he who has learned the lesson of the Incarnation "must be filled with a sublime reverence for his own humanity, . . . and keep it pure and sacred as a holy thing."³¹ It begets new respect not only for self but for the humanity of others,—its chief service to the minister. It causes him to give interest, pastorally, to seemingly insignificant souls, "as a magistrate sees all the dignity of the law represented in the settlement of a petty quarrel that is brought before his court."³² It causes him as a preacher not to look on his functions as that of a ferryman who carries a crowd of passengers ceaselessly across the same line without ever asking their names but as "the tutor of a family of princes, who, with careful study of their several dispositions, trains the royal nature of each for the special kingdom over which he is to rule."³³

4. Finally, *it saves us from despair about humanity*. "Among the differences which have been in the world since Christ's will came, is not this one of the greatest, that the best of men in all their hopes and struggles have hoped and struggled in the presence of a visible success?"³⁴ The Christ life was achieved once, therefore, it is achievable by men in our world. It raises our hopes, for "Christ was what man had felt in his soul he might be."³⁵ "What Christ was we shall be some day, and because we shall be it some day, we may begin to be it right now."³⁶ However gross and bad man seems to be, he is still capable of receiving and containing God.³⁷ "It is because he is the child [of God] by nature that he is capable of becoming the child of grace."³⁸

II

In what relation does the view of the Incarnation just sketched stand to historic theology? In substance it was orthodoxy, the faith delivered to the saints, the core of doctrine defended by Athanasius at Nicea.³⁹ But as he interpreted the timeless doctrine that God was in Christ, Brooks did three things to it. First, he *universalized* it. God was in Christ, and, as

³⁰ Quoted, Allen, II, 539.

³¹ *The Battle of Life*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1893, p. 320.

³² *Lectures on Preaching*, p. 272.

³³ *Ibid.*, 262.

³⁴ *Visions and Tasks*, p. 281.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 282.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 296.

³⁷ Sermon preached on return to Boston, 1883, quoted, Allen, II, 445.

³⁸ *Influence of Jesus*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1879, p. 16.

³⁹ Allen stresses this point, II, 841.

we have seen, by the same token he may be in all men. Brooks never questioned the historic union of divinity and humanity in Christ. He was no Arian. He simply gave the Incarnation unlimited application. He did not feel, as Lowell contended about Newman, that God was the great "I WAS," rather than the great "I AM." Further he never felt, as the Unitarians, that to exalt man we must reduce Christ's divinity. He proclaimed that presence of God in Christ is a prophecy of what may be in every man. Incarnation is a law of the universe of which the Life in Galilee is the one supreme illustration.

Secondly, he *humanized* it. Brooks never played down the divinity of our Lord nor the divine implication of his life. He played up its human reverence. To be sure, he seems to have assigned a human ego to Jesus. He undoubtedly would not have accepted the two-nature doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon, with its assumption of a radical disparity between God and man. He saw the Incarnation as bringing man and his Creator nearer to each other. Yet, on the whole he did not deny the theological significance of Jesus. He preached it with glorious success but the emphasis, the place where he bore down most heavily, was on its human meaning. He insisted that we must not lose humanity in trying to interpret deity: the Madonna is a better symbol of the religious instinct than the Sphinx.⁴⁰ As under the preceding point we have noted that Brooks did not deny the particular Incarnation in order to assert the universal, so here he enlarged again, placing a much-needed human reference beside the divine.

Finally, he *moralized* it. Again, he expended no effort in refuting the speculative distinctions of patristic theology, though he would have been the first to renounce the notion that men could be saved by the communication of metaphysical essence alone. He affirmed: In Christ the divine will for man was matched with perfect obedience, and the mark of incarnation in us, too, can never be less than moral.

While in substance Brooks was orthodox he is obviously not *neo-orthodox*! The very things that Brooks proclaimed so triumphantly are what Barth and Brunner scorn: the "historical Jesus,"—"a fantasy picture conjured up by the liberal outlook of the last century,"⁴¹—the continuity between the divine and human, the universal revelation of God in human experience, and the basic optimism about human nature. "God," "Christ," and "Man," of the Barthian theology have little in common with the same realities in Brooks's theology, except the name. He is as much a child of

⁴⁰ Cf. *Influence of Jesus*, pp. 73, 74.

⁴¹ Cf. Brunner, Emil, *The Mediator*. Presbyterian Board, 1947, pp. 189-90.

Greek theology as they are of the Latin. He grounded his view of Christ as much in the Fourth Gospel and Origen as the dialectical theology roots in Paul and Augustine.

In spirit Brooks belongs with the liberals, so long as liberalism is not equated with naturalism! He insisted on freedom of the mind: he gave the best definition of tolerance it has been the writer's fortune to meet,—“the willing consent that other men should hold and express opinions with which we disagree, until they are convinced by reason that those opinions are untrue.”⁴² He has the appeal to experience, which has been the hallmark of modern thought. While he did not mention Schleiermacher and Ritschl, he approached theology in their empirical manner. He affirmed, like the moderns, that the uniqueness of Jesus is due to the degree of the presence of the divine Spirit within him. Of course, the essentially optimistic view Brooks took of man rounds out the liberal picture.

But all this should not lead us to think of Brooks as a humanist. He was no Pelagian. He never taught that man can work out his own salvation without divine help. He never made the naturalistic distinction between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith. He never talked about Jesus as “a religious genius.” Indeed, he is at great pains, as he brings his lectures on *The Influence of Jesus* to a close, to show what distance stands between Christ, the divine Savior, and Socrates, the best of human teachers.⁴³

I know not what to say to any man who does not feel the difference. I can almost dream what Socrates would say to any man who said that there was no difference between Jesus and him. But how shall we state the difference? One is divine and human; the other is human only. One is Redeemer; the other is philosopher. One is inspired, the other questions. One reveals, and the other argues.

Phillips Brooks's doctrine of the Incarnation is the child of the marriage of the liberal spirit with the historic religious tradition.

III

What does Brooks have to teach us? Very little, speculatively. He made no original contributions to the reflective life of the church. He was not indifferent to theology, as we have seen. He was not ignorant of it: he was a thorough student of the Church Fathers. But for metaphysics, in and for itself, he had no interest. He had little appreciation of speculation as such. When his friend, George Gordon, mentioned to him the intellectual grandeur of Jonathan Edwards he got the reply, “Oh, yes, a

⁴² *Tolerance*, p. 49.

⁴³ *The Influence of Jesus*, p. 243.

brooding kind of creature and nothing more."⁴⁴ Phillips Brooks was an interpreter, not a theological pioneer.

Yet his interpretation is of great value for anyone concerned with the Kingdom. He shows us, first of all, that *theology is at the heart of great preaching*. The man in the pulpit need not be a theological expert nor an innovator. But let the core of his message be theological if he would move men. The rather peripheral position to which theology is assigned by so many preachers in our day meets its constant rebuke in the example of Phillips Brooks. "Preach doctrine," he says to the men at Yale in his Beecher Lectures. "Preach all the doctrine that you know, and learn forever more and more."⁴⁵

He shows us not only that effective homiletics is theological but gives a moving exhibit of what *the content of that preaching is: the Incarnation*. Phillips Brooks had "an instinct for the jugular." He saw with unerring eye that Jesus Christ is the essence of the gospel,—neither the man of Galilee nor the spiritual Presence of the post-Resurrection days alone, but God and man as one unit of power, manifested both in the historic Jesus and the religious experience of the centuries since. The preaching which won the first victories over heathenism, unhinged the Roman Empire, and built the church was not ethics (though it was ethical). It was proclamation of a vision of God revealed in Christ. It was not exhortation as to how to meet this or that "life-situation" in particular, but the victorious expression of the innermost meaning of the world, which invests all life's situations with significance, combined with an offer of power. The doctrine that God was in Christ in the fullness and sublimity of its import *is* the gospel, and Brooks saw it with unclouded eyes.

Furthermore *he shows us how to preach the Incarnation by translating the dogma into life*.⁴⁶ Every event in the world is a cluster of relationships: try to define any term without relating it! Brooks simply laid hold of the Great Event and traced its human connections. He asked what difference it made to the men and women who looked to him Sunday after Sunday for help. He was aware of its bearings within the total web of theological scholarship. But his first interest was to make it available for men. And are not the implications he drew from God's presence in Christ relevant to these anxious evil-filled days on which we've fallen,—the possibility of fellowship with God, the naturalness of the Christian life, reverence for human

⁴⁴ Gordon, G. A., *My Education and Religion*. Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1925, p. 301.

⁴⁵ *Lectures on Preaching*, p. 129.

⁴⁶ For stress on this point, see Allen, II, 493-495.

personality, and hope for the race? Preaching at its best moves about two foci,—the eternal Truth and the ever-changing temporal needs of man. Brooks shows us how to transform the high voltage of theological dogma so that it lights, warms, and ennobles the places where men live and do their work.

Dialectical theology is on the horizon now. Speculatively it is a much-needed correction to humanistic presumption, but, practically, it will meet its Waterloo when a generation of preachers try seriously to make it their message. For by nature it moves about one focus, the eternal; and "there is an infinite qualitative difference between time and eternity." How can a God who by definition is "totally other"—*ganz anders*—be made intelligible? How can a Christ who is not to be construed as either a teacher or an example give sermons the rich, vital content that redeems them from dullness? Further, if human freedom is illusion, or if man can do nothing, actually, to effect his own salvation (and what lift is there for weary and heavy-laden humanity in the return of the gospel of human depravity?)—what is the point of preaching, anyway? For Karl Barth the Incarnation is a *problem* to the natural man who sits in our pews. For Phillips Brooks it is a glorious *answer*. This is why Dean Sperry, a teacher of homiletics and a distinguished exemplar of the art, is within the truth when he says neo-orthodoxy in its more extreme statements can never "be got across a pulpit edge in the average American Protestant church, in such form that they will be intelligible and carry conviction."⁴⁷

Today the American Protestant pulpit tends toward two extremes. On the one hand, there is a widespread neglect of theology, particularly by the problem-preachers who go under the banner of liberals. On the other is the attempt to proclaim an inherently unpreachable theology, the fault of the orthodox, old and new. There is a more excellent way,—the translation of timeless dogmas into timely precepts, as the great master of old Trinity shows us how to do.

Finally, Brooks teaches that the Incarnation is not only the essence of the Christian gospel; it is *the essence of preaching*. The Incarnation is not a historical fact become dogma. *It is a method* of propagating the gospel. To point this fact was the purpose of the famed Yale Lectures. Preaching is "the continuation, out to the minutest ramification of the new system of influences, of that personal method which the Incarnation itself had involved."⁴⁸ Truth in its sheer, austere truthfulness ought to arouse

⁴⁷ Sperry, W. L., *Jesus—Then and Now*. Harper & Brothers, 1949, p. 12.

⁴⁸ *Lectures on Preaching*, p. 7.

men to action. But it doesn't. Only as the Word becomes flesh and dwells among us, full of grace and truth, does it have moving power. The personality of the preacher, the degree of his embodiment of his truth, is an ineradicable factor in the pulpit's influence.

Here was Brooks's strength. He once received a letter written by a working man who called himself "one of the crowd who do not go to church, yet am consciously better because you are here:"⁴⁰

I wonder if you have any sort of conception how many there are of us who are made better and try to be more useful as a result of your example. To me you reveal God as no other man does. What I mean by that is, I can't think of you for ten consecutive minutes without forgetting all about you and thinking of God instead; and when I think of God and wonder how he will seem to me, it always comes around to trying to conceive of you enlarged infinitely in every way.

His personality was a witness to his doctrine: his own life was an extension of the Incarnation!

⁴⁰ Allen, *op. cit.*, II, 876.

Jewish Universalism

BERNARD J. BAMBERGER

HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS of the Jewish religion make frequent reference to the contrasting concepts "universalism" and "particularism," and with good reason. But these expositions often assume that the two trends were mutually hostile and ultimately irreconcilable. Moreover, the expositors, according to predilection, usually label one of these tendencies good and the other bad. Both assumptions are unnecessary and misleading.

The human individual has strong instincts of self-preservation and self-assertion. He feels likewise a great need to identify himself with a social group and assume responsibilities toward it. These two impulses sometimes come into conflict; yet it is possible to effect a large measure of balance and harmony between them. Most of us believe that the individual can find personal fulfillment only through participation in the life of the community, small and large; and that society advances with the increase of richly developed individual personalities.

Now social groups of every size and description seem to have a continuing vitality and "personality" that transcend their organizational forms. All sorts of sentiments and loyalties converge on the social organism, so that (like a biological entity) it seeks to perpetuate itself by adjustment to changing conditions. An organization established for a specific purpose should logically go out of existence when its goal is attained. Frequently, however, its members or leaders will discover or devise another function for their group, that its "will to live" may be justified.

This corporate will to live corresponds to the individual's urge for self-preservation. But societies, like individuals, fulfill themselves adequately only when their existence helps to enrich the life of humanity and to serve the common good. The adjustment of these two aims constitutes a problem, but not necessarily an insoluble problem. The urge to maintain the corporate existence of the group is "particularism"; the desire to serve mankind is "universalism."

BERNARD J. BAMBERGER, D.D., is Rabbi of the West End Synagogue, New York City, President of the Synagogue Council of America, and author of a standard work, *Proselytism in the Talmudic Period*. At the invitation of the editors, he has set forth another viewpoint from that of "The Immutable Values of a Universal Faith," by Rabbi Elmer Berger, in *RELIGION IN LIFE*, Autumn 1950.—Rabbi Bamberger wishes to thank Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer for many helpful suggestions.

I

The universal aspect of Judaism received its clearest and most radical formulation in the words of the great prophets; but it is already explicit in the Mosaic law. The Pentateuch proclaims one God who is the Creator of all men. Man—without qualification—was made in his image. Mankind, moreover, is one not only by dependence on the same Deity, but by virtue of a common ancestry. The people of Israel do not trace their descent from a divine race (as was related in the myths of so many ancient and even modern nations); their relatively late emergence in history is plainly recognized. That Abraham, the progenitor of the Jewish people, was the heir of an already ancient civilization is as clear from the Bible itself as from the excavations at Ur.

The Torah, in addition to affirming the universal God and the unity of mankind, proclaims a universal moral law: universal in that it is binding on all men (Gen. 9) and that it must be practiced toward all men. It insists repeatedly, "There shall be one law for the native and for the foreigner" (Exod. 12:49, Lev. 24:22, Num. 15:15, 16, etc.). The golden rule is specifically applied to the foreigner: "The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the home born, and you shall love him as yourself" (Lev. 19:34).¹

Particularly impressive are the sections of the law that deal with slavery. This institution was not only established in practice throughout the ancient world: it was defended and rationalized as highly respectable. Most eminent among its theoretical advocates, no doubt, was Aristotle, with his cool, "realistic" argument that a genuine culture requires the leisure that slaves alone can provide, and his casual assignment of slaves to a sub-human status. Far different was the spirit of the Torah. A frontal effort to abolish chattel slavery could not yet be attempted; but stringent limitations were placed on the power of the master. The slave received his freedom if the master inflicted a serious permanent injury on him—such as destroying the sight of an eye or knocking out a tooth (Exod. 21:26, 27). Still more remarkable is the provision forbidding the community to return a runaway slave to his master, and requiring them to admit the fugitive to residence (Deu. 23:16, 17, in Jewish version). According to Jewish tradition, these laws apply specifically to the slave of non-Israelite origin, since the protection of "Hebrew slaves" was provided for in other ways.

The duty to protect the foreigner, the slave, and the underprivileged

¹ Biblical references are from the Jewish Publication Society version, in some cases modified slightly by the author for the sake of clarity.

is constantly associated by the lawgiver with the cardinal event of Jewish history—the liberation from Egyptian bondage. “You shall not oppress a stranger—you know how it feels to be a stranger, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt” (Exod. 23:9). The Sabbath is to be observed in such a way that “your manservant and maidservant may rest as well as you, for you shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt” (Deut. 5:14, 15). The national experience of Israel supplies the motive for a universalistic morality.

The great prophets reaffirm the doctrine of one God, one humanity, and one moral law. To this they added a corollary not explicit in the Torah—the vision of a common goal for mankind, the attainment under God of universal brotherhood and peace. This is the ideal that the Pharisees later summed up in the phrase “the kingdom of God.” It is hardly necessary to quote the familiar but ever glorious passages in which the prophetic goal is set forth. We need consider only one document entirely devoted to the universal ideal—the Book of Jonah, with its double message that God’s control extends over the entire universe and that his compassion encompasses all his children. This superb little book is the traditional prophetic lesson for the afternoon of the Day of Atonement, the most solemn observance in the Jewish religious calendar.

But while the lawgiver and the prophets transcended the limits of a narrow or selfish nationalism, they did not fail in love and loyalty to their own people. Their grandiose visions of a redeemed and united humanity include the expectation that Israel will continue its corporate existence. They dream of the day when nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, when nation shall not lift up sword against nation nor learn war any more. But this international harmony will be based on a divine teaching that goes forth literally from Zion and Jerusalem (Isa. 2:2, 3). Or as Zechariah puts it: “In those days it shall come to pass that ten men out of all the languages of the nations shall take hold of the garment of him that is a Jew, saying, ‘We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you’ ” (Zech. 8:23).

The most extraordinary expression of this spirit is found in a prophecy that predicts the ultimate reconciliation and redemption of Assyria and Egypt, the two great rival empires of the ancient world. Both had repeatedly invaded, ravaged, and oppressed the land of Israel; and it is not surprising that many biblical writers hoped that both empires would be utterly destroyed. But a great seer looked beyond the period of punishment and destruction to the day when the two contending powers should be reconciled with one another and with little Israel, their victim; and God

should say, "Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance" (Isa. 19:25). This sublime universalism does not preclude the expectation of Jewish national survival.

The prophetic universalism is fused with "particularism" in the doctrine of *the mission of Israel*, which was taught most clearly by the unknown seer of the Exile. This doctrine seems to have been generated by a paradox: the God of the whole world is acknowledged only by one small people! Surely, then, this people, "in whose hearts his law is found," must be charged with the task of testifying before mankind to his cosmic power and righteousness. Israel is called as the servant of the Lord, to be a light of the nations, "to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house" (Isa. 42:7). It is instructive to compare this Scripture with Virgil's statement of the mission of his people: "Thou, O Roman, remember to rule peoples by thy might. These shall be thine arts: to impose the law of peace, to spare those that submit, and to crush the proud in war" (*Aeneid* 6:852-4). The belief in the election of Israel has nothing in common with this notion of a people chosen to conquer and crush. The prophet's call to his people reflects not chauvinistic arrogance, but a profound sense of responsibility. This idea, too, appeared first in the Torah: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod. 19:6).

The Jewish teachers were not content merely to express pious sentiments as to their universal aim. They inaugurated a great missionary movement, beginning shortly after the return from the Babylonian exile. The extent of this effort has not been fully recognized by students: it has left its impress on many biblical writings. We quote one notable evidence:

Also the aliens that join themselves to the Lord, to minister unto him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the sabbath from profaning it and holdeth fast unto my covenant, even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be acceptable upon mine altar, for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples, saith the Lord who gathereth the dispersed of Israel: yet will I gather others to him beside those of him that are gathered (Isa. 56:6-8).

II

The Jewish missionary effort continued with increasing momentum throughout the period of the Second Commonwealth, and was not interrupted either by the fall of the Jewish state or by the rise of Christianity. So far as our sources inform us, there were no specific persons or organizations charged with the responsibility of disseminating the knowledge of Judaism among the heathen; the regular Jewish teachers directed their in-

struction to the Gentiles as well as to their own coreligionists. Many strangers came to hear the preaching in the synagogue; the distinctive family life of the Jews attracted decent people who were disgusted with the breakdown of morals in the Hellenistic age. We still possess some interesting samples of the propaganda literature written for the Greek-speaking public; the missionary effort, however, was carried on not only in the Hellenistic diaspora, but also in Palestine and in Babylonia.

After Christianity had become the official religion of the Roman Empire, the police power of the state was invoked to stop Jewish missionary activity, and even to prevent Jews from accepting proselytes who came of their own accord. Similar policies were later adopted by the Moslem rulers. The Jewish missionary movement was not immediately halted; but unremitting pressure brought it gradually to a standstill. Its last great success was in the eighth century, when the royal family and a large part of the population of the Chazars—in what is now southeastern Russia—adopted the Jewish faith. The Chazar rulers, be it noted, accorded religious freedom to their Christian and Moslem subjects. Their kingdom was destroyed in 1018 by a Russo-Byzantine coalition; from that day to this, liberty of conscience has been banned from Russian soil. And during the last thousand years, the Jewish community, while continuing to receive individual proselytes, has made no systematic missionary effort.

It would be an endless task to trace the universal elements in Jewish thought through the centuries. We should find grist for our mill in the legal discussions and homilies of the Rabbis, the speculations of medieval philosophers, and the mystic flights of the Cabalists. Of even greater importance for our purpose are the traditional prayers of the synagogue, which were known to the unlearned as well as to the scholars. The universal outlook, derived from biblical sources, is expressed in many passages of the liturgy, and is particularly prominent in the ritual for the New Year. This ritual, which also contains petitions for the restoration of the Jewish state under a Davidic king, and for the rebuilding of the temple, includes such paragraphs as this:

Our God and God of our fathers, reign over the whole universe in Thy glory, and in Thy splendor be exalted over all the earth. Shine forth in the majesty of Thy triumphant strength over all the inhabitants of Thy world, that every form may know that Thou hast formed it, and every creature understand that Thou hast created it, and all that hath breath in its nostrils may say: "The Lord God of Israel is King, and His dominion ruleth over all."²

² From *The Service of the Synagogue*. George Routledge & Sons, London.

This prayer was composed early in the Christian era. A New Year's hymn written about 600 enlarges on the theme. In Israel Zangwill's translation it runs:

All the world shall come to serve Thee
 And bless Thy glorious name,
 And Thy majesty triumphant
 The islands shall acclaim,
 And the peoples shall go seeking
 Who knew Thee not before,
 And the ends of earth shall praise Thee
 And tell Thy greatness o'er.

They shall build for Thee their altars,
 Their idols overthrown,
 And their graven gods shall shame them
 As they turn to Thee alone.
 They shall worship Thee at sunrise,
 And feel Thy kingdom's might,
 And impart their understanding
 To those astray in night.

They shall testify Thy greatness,
 And of Thy power speak,
 And extol Thee, shrined, uplifted
 Beyond man's highest peak,
 And with reverential homage,
 Of love and wonder born,
 With the ruler's crown of beauty,
 Thy head they shall adorn.

With the coming of Thy kingdom
 The hills shall break into song,
 And the islands laugh exultant
 That they to God belong.
 And all their congregations
 So loud Thy praise shall sing,
 That the uttermost peoples, hearing,
 Shall hail Thee crownéd king."³

Here we must register a striking fact. The most glowing expressions of Jewish universalism often appeared in organic relation with particularist, national elements. We have seen this already in the case of the Hebrew prophets. The successful revolt of the Maccabees resulted in the establishment of an independent Judean state, an event which called forth much patriotic fervor. Yet it was precisely in the Maccabean period that Jewish missionary effort became intensive. The Pharisees were not, as has some-

³ From *The Service of the Synagogue*.

times been supposed, "narrow nationalists," but they certainly strove for the corporate survival of their people in a time of crisis. Yet these Pharisees were said to "compass land and sea to make one proselyte," and this report is fully corroborated by their own records. One of their most eminent disciples, at the end of the first Christian century, declared that the pious of all peoples have a share in the world to come. This doctrine was generally accepted by succeeding generations and is echoed by the medieval Jewish philosophers.

The same fusion of universalism and particularism is exemplified on the contemporary scene by Martin Buber. No Jewish religious thinker of recent years has exerted comparable influence on the Christian world. His little book *I and Thou* has made a profound impression on present-day Protestant theology; it is pervaded by a lofty spirituality that rises above all denominationalism. Yet Buber has always been an ardent—though not a typical—Zionist.

III

Jewish teachers of the past two centuries have specially stressed the universal aspects of their doctrine. This trend coincided with the effort to end the long period of ghetto segregation and oppression, and to integrate the Jew politically and culturally into modern life. The new emphasis was most strongly marked in Reform or Liberal Judaism, which drastically revised the traditions of ceremonial observance—some of which were segregatory in effect, whatever their intent—and vigorously upheld the primacy of the ethical and spiritual elements in Judaism. The early Reformers also rejected the hope of a return to Palestine under a messianic king, and the restoration of temple and sacrifice. (All this took place decades before the rise of modern secular Zionism.)

But Reform cannot rightly claim a monopoly of Jewish universalism. The movement out of the physical and cultural ghetto began with Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786), the friend of Lessing. Philosophically a typical rationalist of the Enlightenment, Mendelssohn was in his personal life an observant and genuinely pious orthodox Jew. Much more fiery and extreme in his championship of tradition was Samuel David Luzzatto of Padua (1800-1865). In externals a man of the western world, Luzzatto regarded the heritage of Greek intellectualism as the basic source of corruption. He denounced every form of rationalism, including that of the great Jewish scholastics like Maimonides. Philosophy, he argued, does not make men good. Science provides them with more efficient instruments for the increase of human misery. Mankind can be redeemed only through

the teachings of the Torah, which center around the principle of compassionate love, and whose purpose is not intellectual but moral culture. To Luzzatto, the preservation of orthodoxy was not a withdrawal from the world, but a means of saving the world.

It must be confessed, too, that the universalism of the Reform teachers was not always drawn unmixed from the wells of Jewish spirituality. In its less appealing forms, it contained a strong tincture of eighteenth-century cosmopolitanism and of nineteenth-century faith in "progress." Sometimes, moreover, the repudiation of Jewish messianism was accompanied by vehement expressions of German or British or American patriotism; and patriotism, though a notable virtue, is not identical with universalism! The Liberal Jewish doctrine at its best may be studied in the ample writings of Rabbi Kaufmann Kohler, the scholarly layman Claude G. Montefiore, and the neo-Kantian philosopher Hermann Cohen.

Special mention must be given to Rabbi Leo Baeck. As a young Liberal Rabbi, he set forth his basic position in a short volume, *Das Wesen des Judentums* (originally published in 1905, revised English translation *The Essence of Judaism*, 1948). He too championed "prophetic Judaism," assigning a secondary place to ritual, and centering his attention on spiritual faith and spiritual living. But from the start he avoided the pitfalls of rationalistic optimism, and pointed out the arduous and tragic character of the prophetic faith. Of this faith he became the visible embodiment when he accepted the heart-breaking task of leadership of the German Jews under the Hitler doom. We recall, for example, the prayer he sent out for reading in the German synagogue on the Day of Atonement, containing the sentence, "We bow before God and stand erect before men." (If only the German people had dared voice such a prayer!) Despite opportunities to come to America, he insisted on staying with his people until the final liquidation of the German Jewish community. And after surviving as by miracle the horrors of the concentration camp, he is today the advocate of militant Jewish missionary effort. He has called for world-wide propaganda for Judaism, seeing in it the last hope of mankind for escape from self-destruction.

IV

Jewish nationalism is certainly a reaction against the facile optimism of the nineteenth century. The sources of this reaction were not philosophic or theological, but factual. The tyrannical cruelty of the Tsars, the cold malice of western anti-Semitism, and the unspeakable horror of the crematoria cannot be dismissed as minor imperfections of our civilization. Zionism

requires no apologia; nor is it surprising that the creation of the State of Israel should have been accompanied by some of the more strident expressions of national spirit. There have indeed been numerous occasions in Jewish history, ancient and modern, when an excess of particularist fervor has somewhat tarnished the radiance of the universal faith. Chauvinism, alas, is not peculiar to any one people or church. The records of racial arrogance, national pride, and ecclesiastical bigotry are disturbingly ample and often shockingly brutal. The Jewish people have shown no special aptitude for these vices. Their bitterest expressions of particularism date from periods of persecution; and the last few decades, be it remembered, have witnessed the worst persecutions in all Jewish history. If the citizens and champions of the Israeli state have sometimes gone to extremes of utterance and even action, we can understand these things without endorsing them.

Yet it would be far from just to see in the rise of Jewish nationalism—or in other popular nationalist trends—no more than reactionary, divisive, and anti-universal tendencies. Is it sheer particularism for us to conduct Community Chest appeals for local philanthropies, or to contribute to the *American Red Cross*? Basic human values are exemplified also when we care for our own children and neighbors. Indeed one looks with justified suspicion on that kind of universalism which concerns itself with those who are far away, to the neglect of responsibilities at home! All mankind has much to learn from the extraordinary decision of the Israeli government, wholeheartedly supported by its people, to keep the doors of their little country open to all Jews seeking refuge.

This subject must be considered not only in connection with Hitler's exterminatory efforts, but in the light (if one dare use the word) of what the free nations failed to do. It may be doubted that the savagery of Dachau was any more inhuman than the chilly indifference of the Évian and Bermuda conferences, at which the democratic nations in effect gave the green light to genocide.⁴ Nor can we pride ourselves on the interminable patience with which *we* bore the despair of the survivors in the DP camps after the liberation of Europe, or the dilatory, ambiguous and at times hostile attitude which the western governments displayed toward

⁴ An intergovernmental conference on refugees was held at Évian, July 6-15, 1938. Over thirty countries, including the United States, took part in this effort to devise a plan to help the victims of Nazi persecution. Despite the sympathetic and humanitarian utterances of the participants, hardly anything was accomplished; the governments were unwilling to relax their immigration restrictions, and Great Britain had stipulated that Palestine should not be discussed. In April, 1943, when the Nazi policies of extermination were already in full operation, an Anglo-American Refugee Conference was held in Bermuda. The sessions were secret, and the conclusions were not even made known till the following November. The practical results were very slight.

them. In sharpest contrast, the people of Israel have continued to receive and to welcome all Jews seeking a haven of refuge. They could have found ample excuse for restricting immigration in the terrific fiscal and military problems with which they are wrestling. But they have accepted real hardship, including the most stringent rationing of food and other commodities, rather than bar out their brother Jews from freedom. This is a lesson in human understanding and generosity from which the whole world can learn.

Jewish nationalism, moreover, through its entire history, has consciously cherished universal human values. The pioneer document of the movement, *A Jewish State* by Theodor Herzl, was written in 1896 in the midst of the excitement of the Dreyfus affair. But despite the emotional upheaval he was experiencing, Herzl included in his pamphlet advanced and liberal proposals for economic and social institutions in the still theoretical commonwealth. As soon as Jewish colonization in Palestine got beyond its tentative beginnings, social experiments of far-reaching consequence began. This is not the place to describe the several types of collective farm colonies in Israel. Unlike the short-lived experiments of nineteenth-century utopians, these undertakings have proved themselves viable because they are free of sentimental romanticism. Unlike the collectives of the Soviet Union, those of Israel are altogether voluntary and are democratically governed by their own members. The final outcome of these experiments cannot yet be determined. But they should be of momentous interest to all those throughout the world who are concerned in building a co-operative way of life in which the profit motive shall not be all dominant, and which shall yet be free from dictation by an inscrutable state.

Nor can we overlook the importance of the Hebrew University, established in the midst of the poverty and destruction that followed the First World War. This is but one of the creative influences which Jewish nationalism has introduced to the Near East. Despite the hostilities of the present day, the example of a people which has transformed swamps and deserts into productive land, improved public health, raised standards of labor, and created democratic political institutions is bound to have far-reaching consequences for poverty-stricken and oppressed millions in neighboring countries.

Many—not all—of the pioneers of modern Palestine have been estranged from the conventional forms and institutions of religion; but they have not lost the sense of spiritual realities and values which pervade

the literature and traditions of their people. This is evident not only from the concrete manifestations just cited, but from many utterances in the new Hebrew literature of our day. This literature is particularly rich in poetry, which for the most part eschews the esoteric and obscure affections of contemporary verse writing, and speaks more directly from and to the heart. As one might expect, the patriotic note is strongly evident; but there is much of more than local import. The return to the soil has heightened the consciousness of the God revealed in nature; and the fellowship of the pioneers has intensified the sense of human comradeship and mutual responsibility. It is impossible here to examine the spiritual values in contemporary Hebrew writing; but we must include four lines of poetry unforgettable both for their substance and their setting.

Hanna Senesch was the daughter of a prosperous Hungarian family, who in her teens settled in a co-operative farm in Palestine. In 1944 she joined a group of young Palestine volunteers whom the British dropped by parachute into the Balkans, to help organize a resistance force which might aid the allied cause and rescue some of the doomed Jews. This heroic adventure surely had more than narrow patriotic implications; it was, however, unsuccessful. Hanna was captured by the Nazis, and was shot as a spy in her native Budapest only a few days before it was liberated. In her prison she penned these lines:

Blessed is the match that is consumed in kindling flame.
 Blessed is the flame that burns in the secret fastness of the heart.
 Blessed is the heart with strength to stop its beating for honor's sake.
 Blessed is the match that is consumed in kindling flame.⁵

V

American Jewish life, finally, presents a good deal of confusion. What was a comparatively small and young Jewish community, culturally and religiously dependent on the older centers of Jewish life, has become in the course of seventy-five years the largest and most influential segment of world Jewry. Its members, while participating ardently in every aspect of American life, have had to assume unprecedented responsibilities toward their brothers overseas. They have had to reckon with the practical and spiritual consequences of a tragedy to which there is no parallel in all human history. A large part of their resources, in both money and manpower, has been pre-empted by the urgent needs of relief and self-defense. American Jewish religious life is still inadequately organized and staffed;

⁵ Translation by Marie Syrkin in her *Blessed Is the Match*, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1947.

and there has not been enough time and energy to rethink all the theoretical and practical questions of religious living.

Individual voices, as we have noted, have been heard calling for a resumption of the ancient Jewish missionary role. But most Jews, so long restrained from such activity by external duress, still find the very notion strange and even alarming. But there is no group in America more eager for every legitimate form of interfaith co-operation, more devoted to American democratic ideals (rooted as they are in the biblical faith), and more deeply consecrated to the building of a world of justice, brotherhood, and peace. And they see no conflict between these ideals and the effort to provide bread and a roof for every Jew who is plagued by want or fear.

Shakespeare and Redemptive Love

ROBERT E. FITCH

THERE IS, OF COURSE, no use in pretending that Shakespeare was a poet of the Christian faith. He had too much of the Renaissance in him for that. And nowhere are the humanist limits of his imagination so apparent as in his portrayal of the clergy, or in his treatment of situations which might have a religious significance.

But if a true humanism may reach up to the very portals of heaven—though it may not enter therein—then Shakespeare was the poet of such a humanism. If, as many mystics have taught, there is a kind of ladder of love, the base of which rests on a solid and carnal foundation, while the top stretches up into the very arms of the Deity, then Shakespeare knew all the steps of that ladder up to the point of its consummation in the divine. For, unlike our modern novelists and dramatists, Shakespeare understood and believed in human love in its noblest dimensions, so that his presentation of a mortal emotion is a kind of preparation for a vision of that emotion in its body of glory.

This is strikingly evident in the great tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet*.¹ Indeed, the Christian imagination may be justified, with all reverence, in reading this play as a kind of human paraphrase of the great drama of the sacrificial and redeeming love of Jesus. For the chief works of love are here portrayed: What love does for the lover. How love comes against hatred and strife. How love copes with vulgarity. How love confronts death. How love, through its Golgotha, brings vicarious atonement to others.

I. LOVE AND THE LOVER

What does love do for the lover?

In the case of Romeo, it makes a man of him. A good part of Act I portrays the false and affected love of Romeo for Rosaline, so that his true love for Juliet may be heightened by the contrast. Romeo's love for

¹ All quotations are from the Yale Shakespeare edition of *Romeo and Juliet*, edited by W. H. Durham, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1917. All references are, in order, to the act, to the scene, and to the lines.

ROBERT E. FITCH, B.D., M.A., Ph.D., is Professor of Christian Ethics at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California. In the master dramatist's depiction of a so-called "profane" love, he finds "sacred" love faithfully mirrored.

Rosaline is puppy love: the love of a self-centered and somewhat mercenary puppy. It is made plain to us that his motive in this affair is simple seduction, and that he has even tempted the lady with "saint-seducing gold." But his preoccupation with himself and with his own emotions is obviously greater than his concern for conquest. During the night he hides out in the woods; during the day he locks himself up in his room. He worries his parents, exasperates and amuses his friends, and tortures himself. He parades a philosophy of disillusionment in artificial conceits. Every act is a pose, and every word is weighted with self-pity. Obviously this lover loves only himself.

But his first vision of Juliet teaches him new emotions—awe, and reverence, and humility. He woos her, not with aggressive self-confidence, but gently and graciously. He kisses her, not in the pride of conquest, but in humble adoration. He discovers in himself fresh strength and courage; he leaps high stone walls; he does not fear the swords of twenty foemen. He experiences a rebirth of the zest for living: now when he is with his friends, he is gay, sportive, and witty—not the moping, whining egotist. He studies charity and forbearance, and reaches out toward a larger fellowship that will embrace those who once were of the enemy: when Tybalt, a Capulet, insults and abuses Romeo, a Montague, Romeo essays, at first, to turn the other cheek and put off wrath with a soft answer. Separated from his Rosaline, he knew only a mawkish melancholy; but banished from his Juliet, he enters into a deep despair, in which he finds himself less happy than any cat or dog or carrion fly. And at the last he learns what any lover of beauty and of excellence must learn—that it is better to die in faithfulness to the object of one's love than to live without it.

In the case of Juliet, there is no dramatic conversion of character, but only a steady growth in moral quality. When we find her, at the start of the play, in the company of her mother and of her nurse, she is modest, innocent, lovely, and obedient. At the initial meeting with Romeo, there is a gracious sweetness in her compliance. In short time, for her as for Romeo, love takes away false pride: in the first scene on the balcony, she readily confesses her affection for Romeo, even though conventional scruples invite her to reticence. Real love insists upon sincerity, humility, and truth. She learns her lesson in loyalty when Romeo slays Tybalt, and she discovers that the death of her cousin Tybalt is infinitely less bitter than the banishment of Romeo. She discovers the meaning of tenderness when, after the secret consummation of their marriage, she must bid farewell to her husband, uncertain when she shall see him again. Her girlish

devotion is tempered into firmness of purpose when her parents threaten to make her marry Count Paris, and when even her own nurse turns against her in counsel. And finally her courage rises to high resolve, as she drinks the sleeping potion to ready herself for a tryst with love in the tomb.

So it is that, for the lover, all the gifts of the spirit are the fruits of love.

II. LOVE CONFRONTS STRIFE

But love is crossed by hatred, and confronted with strife. The hatred is between the house of Montague and the house of Capulet—the house of Romeo and the house of Juliet.

There is no reason given for the hatred. It is an irrational, customary hatred, in which even the petty servants participate. Shakespeare best exhibits the quality of it in one of the brilliant and flippant discourses of Mercutio—addressed to Benvolio, of all people!—in which we get a portrait of the congenital quarreler:

Thou! why, thou wilt quarrel with a man that hath a hair more or a hair less in his beard than thou hast. Thou wilt quarrel with a man for cracking nuts, having no other reason but because thou hast hazel eyes. What eye, but such an eye, would spy out such a quarrel? Thy head is as full of quarrels as an egg is full of meat, and yet thy head hath been beaten as addle as an egg for quarrelling. Thou hast quarrelled with a man for coughing in the street, because he hath wakened thy dog that hath lain asleep in the sun. Didst thou not fall out with a tailor for wearing his new doublet before Easter? with another, for tying his new shoes with old riband? ²

Actually, Mercutio is describing himself, not Benvolio. He is also describing Tybalt, and the whole tribe of the Montagues and of the Capulets with all their retainers.

It is part of the irony of life that, when love intervenes in strife, it may only deepen the tragedy. So when Romeo tries to stop the brawling between Mercutio and Tybalt, it merely provides the occasion for Tybalt, under the shelter of Romeo's arm, to make a mortal thrust at Mercutio. In his last moments Mercutio is suddenly disillusioned of his folly in fighting:

A plague o' both your houses! . . . Help me into some house, Benvolio, Or I shall faint. A plague o' both your houses! They have made worms' meat of me: I have it, And soundly too:—your houses! ³

So they that take the sword perish by the sword.

But, more than that, the sword of strife is sharp enough to strike at

² III, 1, 16ff.

³ III, 1, 105ff.

the very heart of love. Romeo, in grief and in despair at the death of his companion, forgets his earlier resolve of meekness, meets Tybalt again, fights him, kills him. And Tybalt is the cousin of his beloved Juliet. This means a momentary tension between the lovers, soon resolved into a deeper loyalty. But it also means banishment—the separation from the beloved—and the final self-destroying gesture of a defeated love.

III. LOVE CONFRONTS VULGARITY

It may not be so terrible a thing that love should confront vulgarity as that it should confront hatred, but vulgarity is as evil a thing as hatred, and it may be a more insidious evil.

The vulgarity in the play is in the person of Juliet's Nurse, and it is an insidious vulgarity because it comes in the guise of devotion and affection. The Nurse has an instinct for the coarse and for the obscene. When she remembers an unclean jest that her late lamented husband made to the innocent child Juliet, it so tickles her fancy that she must repeat it three or four times. She swears by a virginity which has not been hers for many a year; bets fourteen teeth on a proposition when there are only four teeth in her head. The two realities in life on which she has a clear grasp—and this makes her our contemporary—are money and sex appeal. Her first bit of advice to Romeo is that he must not take advantage of the innocence of Juliet; for the Nurse assumes that this love affair, like all that she has known, must be a cheap one. She is more eloquent in a description of the physical proportions of a Romeo or of a Paris than in an account of their characters. As for the man that is to marry Juliet, he will come into great good fortune, because Juliet's family has "the chinks"—i.e. the dough!

In her, too, vanity keeps pace with vulgarity. She loves to strut the streets when she can give orders to her man Peter; and, when she comes across young gentlemen, she smirks behind her fan in mock modesty. Her vanity, her desire for attention, her determination to hold the center of the scene, must be nourished even at the expense of the feelings of others. When Juliet is eager for news from Romeo, the Nurse makes a prolonged act of it, jabbars on of this and of that, complains of fatigue and of a headache, has herself waited on, rubbed, scratched, and cajoled, before she will deliver the essential. When she is reporting the death of Tybalt to Juliet, she carries on at first as though it were Romeo that were slain. When she is reporting back again to Romeo, she makes him think, for a while, that Juliet is more grieved by the death of Tybalt than concerned for the banishment of Romeo. Even at that moment when, presumably, she finds Juliet

dead in the chamber, the old Nurse does not forget her histrionics. Shrill, loud, and insistent in her lamentations, she disputes the stage with death itself.

Is she not affectionate, and is she not loyal? Yes, in the manner of the vain and of the vulgar. Well-intentioned, garrulous, superficial, coquettish, materialistic, sentimental, obscene, mildly mercenary, a coward in a crisis—she is faithful after her fashion. She has nerve enough to protest when old Capulet is rough and overly harsh with his daughter. But at the moment when Juliet must decide whether to be loyal to her lover to the death, or to live a lie and marry Paris in obedience to her parents' wishes, it is the Nurse who counsels worldly wisdom and betrayal, and so leaves Juliet utterly alone.

"Ancient damnation! O most wicked fiend!"⁴—this is Juliet's judgment on the Nurse in whom vanity and vulgarity are stronger than honor and love. It is a harsher judgment than anywhere in the play is made on any other party.

IV. LOVE CONFRONTS DEATH

Love is touched by vulgarity, but is not tarnished by it. Love is torn by strife, but is not overcome by it. But love has yet to meet the great champion, death.

In any case, true love does not fall back before death. Juliet confronts death as she prepares to drink the potion that will place her for a while in the tomb of the Capulets. She is firm in her resolve to do it, but she cannot check the imagination which pictures for her, in vivid detail, all the horrors of the charnel house where she must sleep and then awake. Fear in its most terrible proportions takes possession of her soul, but it is not powerful enough to divert her from her purpose. "Romeo, I come! This do I drink to thee."⁵ This is Juliet's Gethsemane. This is the cup which she would rather have pass away from her. Nevertheless, because love is stronger than death, she drinks of the cup.

When Romeo learns prematurely of the funeral of Juliet, and thinks that she is dead, he hastens to the burial place. He attacks it with a crowbar. Thus, in dramatic symbolism, love assaults the tomb:

Thou detestable maw, thou womb of death. . . .
Thus I enforce thy rotten jaws to open.⁶

⁴ III, 5, 235.

⁵ IV, 3, 59.

⁶ V, 3, 45, 47.

When Romeo finds Juliet lying there, it seems to him that somehow the tomb is transfigured by her beauty:

A grave? O, no! a lantern, . . .
For here lies Juliet, and her beauty makes
This vault a feasting presence full of light.⁷

Shakespeare knows, and so do we, that Juliet is not really dead; she only sleeps. So it is the beauty of the living Juliet that ministers to Romeo's illusion that somehow she has not been overcome by death:

O my love! my wife!
Death, that hath suck'd the honey of thy breath,
Hath had no power upon thy beauty:
Thou art not conquer'd; beauty's ensign yet
Is crimson in thy lips and in thy cheeks,
And death's pale flag is not advanced there.⁸

Yet who will say whether our knowledge of the facts or Romeo's faith in his illusion points to the greater truth? For the lover has perceived that there is a power mightier than the grave; and if he does not hesitate, shortly, to join Juliet in death in the tomb, it is because he knows that greater than death is love.

V. LOVE BRINGS VICARIOUS ATONEMENT

The further outcome of this business is not of prime interest to Shakespeare. Yet because his ethical insight is always true and sound, he does not fail to bring the matter to a moral conclusion. The houses of Capulet and of Montague are reconciled to one another. The tragic death of the two young lovers has brought the quarreling factions to their senses.

Because the tale belongs to the Renaissance—and neither to the Reformation nor to the Christian medieval past—there is no thought of a future life for the lovers. The immortality of each will be preserved in a "statue in pure gold," which the Montague will erect for the daughter of the Capulet, and which the Capulet will erect for the son of the Montague. Rather cold comfort, this, as compared to the possibilities of a Christian faith!

Nevertheless, the lovers have made vicarious atonement for the sins of their fathers and of their mothers. They have taken upon their innocent persons a burden of guilt which was not theirs. They have made possible for others a peace and a love which they could not have themselves. And

⁷ V, 3, 84-86.

⁸ V, 3, 91-96.

this work of redemption could be accomplished only through them—not through any other.

Not through political authority. The Prince is the symbol of this authority. But he can only chide and chastise. He cannot touch the heart of the matter.

Not through mere good will. Benvolio is this good will. In the very first scene of the play he appears, in dramatic symbol, to separate the feuding servants of the two houses: "Part, fools! Put up your swords; you know not what you do."⁹ But if there is any utterly ineffectual character in the play, it is this same Benvolio, this same good will.

Not through right reason, either. Friar Laurence, in spite of his Franciscan trappings, is this right reason. Like so many of Shakespeare's clergy, he is but a humanist in monk's clothing. When Romeo is in the very depths of despair, the Friar offers him, by way of consolation, not religion, mind you, but philosophy—"Adversity's sweet milk, philosophy."¹⁰ And Romeo tells him to "Hang up philosophy!"¹¹ if philosophy cannot restore his Juliet to him. If this Friar, one thinks, had been a true disciple of Saint Francis, he would have offered Romeo, at this juncture, not philosophy but the cross!

But Shakespeare is a bit of an anticlerical. He understands the cross all right, but somehow or other he can never get it into the correct ecclesiastical setting. In any case, Romeo and Juliet will find their cross, and it is through their crucifixion—not by might, nor by wisdom, nor by good will—that others will find their peace.

SACRED AND PROFANE LOVE

The reader may be reminded, at this point, that we began our meditation by way of a paraphrase on the life and passion of Christ. Is it really necessary to carry out the parallel in every detail? Or is it not already obvious that the chapter headings for the one tale are apposite to the other? How love in Christ confronted hatred and strife. How love in Christ confronted vanity and vulgarity. How love in Christ confronted death. How love in Christ brought vicarious atonement through its own sacrifice. Surely in these two stories the love that we call sacred and the love that we call profane are one.

⁹ I, 1, 70-71.

¹⁰ III, 3, 54.

¹¹ III, 3, 56.

If anyone feels that this is forcing the analogy beyond the limits of propriety, let him read again these lines from Saint Paul:

Love is patient and kind; love is not jealous or boastful; it is not arrogant or rude. Love does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice at wrong, but rejoices in the right. Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. Love never ends. . . .¹²

and then let him ask himself if there is any word here that a Romeo and a Juliet would not understand. Indeed, may it not be that our own incomprehension of the quality of the heavenly love is due to our cheap profanation, in these days, of the love that is human?

¹² I Corinthians 13:4-8. Revised Standard Version.

Educating for Democracy in Africa

JOHN M. SPRINGER

AFRICA has been affected by the rise and development of democracy in Europe. Five governments of Europe control all but a small portion of Africa. In 1876, ten per cent only of Africa's surface was under European control; in 1912, ninety-five per cent. Whatever happens to democracy in Europe, for betterment or otherwise, is bound to have immediate and determinative effects in Africa. Happily, most of the nations administering in Africa today are democratic, in theory at least, in their forms of government.

Except for limited portions of her area, Africa has until well into the past century lain apart from the life of the rest of the world. During the past century the major portion of that continent has been drawn, and not always too gently, out of its former comparative isolation. Today Africa has a large place and an important one in that One World in which for weal or for woe we now find ourselves.

Africa is not a country, but a continent. This vast continent is a unity only in continuity of surface. Ethnically and politically it never has been a unity. With over thirty governments operating within its shores, and with foreign elements of population increasing and drawn from the ends of the earth, the likelihood of political unity decreases rather than otherwise.

A democracy bespeaks as a basic principle the necessity of approximate universal literacy. And in this respect the situation generally in Africa is at least somewhat reassuring as to beginnings and policies. Theoretically, at least, every colonizing power operating in Africa is today committed to making primary education ultimately available for all.

Evolution, growth, takes time. The heartening fact is that a number of these colonial governments faced this task seriously years ago. In several of the colonies good beginnings have been made and there is steady advance toward the ultimate goals. Five-year, ten-year programs and objectives are set forth in some cases, and are being acted upon. There is

BISHOP JOHN M. SPRINGER, Ph.B., D.D., LL.D., has been a missionary to Africa since 1901, and Missionary Bishop for Africa, 1936-1944; he is now retired. Africa is moving, and rapidly, he tells us. Whither? There is urgency to give Christian direction to Africa.

a beginning of making secondary education available more widely. In some of the older colonies and countries, college and university courses for Africans are today operative.

In most colonies the missions, usually the Protestant, have established the first schools. Hesitatingly, at first, and then more and more readily and liberally, the governments have given grants-in-aid to such mission-conducted schools. As grants have increased, the governments have assumed the right largely to determine the curriculum, to set the standards, to have entrance to the schools for inspection. Usually all this is in the interests of better standards of education. Religious instruction in one or more periods is almost universally provided for. Herein particularly, as well as in the entire conduct of the school, lies the great, at least a very great, evangelizing opportunity of the missions. The missions usually have charge also of the normal, the teacher-training schools, and this with governmental grants-in-aid. The constituencies back of the missions need to realize that here is their major opportunity and responsibility to insure, at least mightily to endeavor, that the teachers they train and turn out become twice-born persons, and so will be able, first by right living, and then by winsome methods to lead pupils to Christ. Evangelical Christians have proved and are proving to be the most promising, the most effective members of democracies.

Some governments are quite satisfied to continue their grants-in-aid, even on an advancing scale of liberality, and to have the missions continue the administration of the schools, both primary and secondary, particularly in the rural sections, as they consider that there the missions can do a better job than the government could.

Within the limits necessarily imposed in an article it is possible to speak only of outstanding characteristics in the various countries and colonies in Africa.

NORTH AND WEST AFRICA

Egypt is under Islamic influence and one hesitates to bespeak or promise much for the mass of its mixed, swarming population, so far as democratic procedure or progress is concerned.

In the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, democratic procedure is observed, in theory at least. The rate of literacy is very low, so a thoroughgoing practice of individual manhood franchise is practically impossible. Actually, in the recent elections the voters were conducted to the polls and instructed how to vote by the religious leaders, who are mostly Islamic.

Ethiopia is a land where tribes, large and small, carried on until two

decades ago in all but complete autonomy. That country has been shaken, and that rudely, in these recent decades. Happily for its peoples, the Emperor is open-minded and liberal in his policies. He has carried through legislation that augurs well for the future. Its trend is toward democratic procedures. The present rate of literacy is low, but the educational program enacted will raise this as increasing revenues are available.

Liberia was established as a republic in 1847. The centennial of that event was elaborately celebrated. Funds to extend greatly the educational program have been lacking. However, recent years have seen the national income much increased, and the excellent educational legislation is now being implemented on a steadily expanding scale. This is made possible by the greater prosperity of local communities arising out of steadily increasing means of travel and of transport. Mining, rubber planting, and other industries are likewise growing.

SOUTH AFRICA

The Union of South Africa is a self-governing Dominion within the British Commonwealth of Nations. Under the British influence that prevailed formerly, even in the face of great odds, substantial progress toward general education (including the natives) had been made. Doors were open in several of the excellent universities for Africans and other non-Europeans to obtain professional training in law and in medicine. Bursaries and scholarships were available on a competitive system.

Since the last election a party with policies and outlook quite dissimilar to those previously followed has been in power. Withdrawal of some rights and opportunities for non-Europeans has been effected.

PORTUGAL

Portugal is the oldest colonizing power in Africa. Nominally, it is a republic. Actually, its determinative policies of government and of administration are dominated by the Roman Church. Like France, Portugal in theory considers the colonies overseas as integral parts of the national domain. By constitutional provision education is ultimately to be universal. Primary schools, including those conducted by missions, Roman Catholic and Protestant; at present serve only about ten per cent, probably less, of the population.

FRANCE

The French give thoroughgoing validity to their principle that their colonial empire is *France d'Outremer*, Overseas France. Deputies from

th
w
ta
th
sc
th
fr
ab
w
Af

in
no
Ne
mi
Ge
thr

col
bui
ally
Afr
Adv

vers
trua
requ
ploy

Add
by P
lishe
to be
colle
budge
cation
3

the overseas constituencies sit in the National Assembly on equal terms with all others.

In the territories in Africa two parallel systems of schools are maintained by the state, the European and the African. This does not mean that there is a classification according to color. Native Africans attend schools of both systems, as do white French children. It simply means that pupils of whatever color in the "European" system schools can pass freely to schools in France and on into the universities without any disabilities. The pupils in the African system, in which children of poorer whites are found, as in Algiers, are trained in practical ways for life in Africa.

The franchise is on an educational and property basis. On the councils in some cases the majority of members are of African blood. There is no color bar to dictate eligibility. Monsieur Felice Eboué, a full-blooded Negro from the French province of Martinique, West Indies, rose in administrative rank in French Equatorial Africa to become in 1940 Governor-General. He held this position, carrying satisfactorily the responsibilities through the war years, until his death in 1944.

BELGIUM

Belgium, as a nation, was the latest comer, 1908, into the African colonizing field. It is a limited monarchy. Its constitution (1831) was built on clearly democratic lines. Franchise for qualified Africans eventually is the accepted policy. It needs to be noted that for some time now Africans have been included in the appointed Colonial and Provincial Advisory Councils.

It is definitely decreed by laws that primary education shall be universal at the earliest practicable date. By-laws deal with the matter of truancy. Concessionary companies, those small states within a state, are required to provide elementary education for the children of their employees.

In 1948 a ten-year program of advance in education was laid out. Additional secondary schools are being opened and existing ones conducted by Protestants subsidized. By the end of that period there are to be established by the government eight or ten "universities" for natives. It remains to be seen what number of native students will by that time be prepared for college courses. It was in the same year, 1948, that subsidies were first budgeted to be paid to Protestant missions toward the very extensive educational work that these had carried forward from their entrance into the

colony in 1868. These grants were paid in 1949 to schools that qualified under the requirements. In 1949-50, the costs of construction of classrooms for teacher-training were widely met by a governmental agency called *Fonds du Bien-Être Indigènes* (funds for the well-being of natives), at Protestant missions as well as at Roman Catholic stations.

Currently, all through the colony, councils formulated mostly along ancient tribal lines care for and administer the minor, and many major, affairs of villages, towns, and tribes. State schools are held for the sons of chiefs, particularly those sons who are likely to succeed to the chieftainship. Other schools also are held to train clerks for the chiefs. The poll tax is in the main collected through the chiefs.

BRITISH DEPENDENCIES

It is the definitely declared policy of the British Government to lead on their colonial units to ultimate self-government. It is the hope that each such unit will choose to remain within the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Southern Rhodesia is a self-governing colony. Actually to date this of course means self-governing by the European colonials. Its department of Native Education is well staffed, and that notably for introducing and supervising soil conservation, irrigation, rotation of crops, forestation, and the general betterment of agriculture.

In harmony with the slogan of its founder, Cecil Rhodes, when Premier of Cape Colony, "Equal rights for all civilized men," its constitution provides that there shall be no discrimination in qualifying for the franchise. In the sixty years since the Pioneer Column came north and entered the country, 400 native Africans had up to January, 1950, qualified to be registered as voters. The number will steadily, probably rapidly, increase now that secondary schools are being opened and a college is in process of being established.

In Northern Rhodesia, a colony under the British Foreign Office, two Africans, directly representative of the native people, were in 1949 seated in the Legislative Assembly. This was stated to be the first instance in the colonies of Africa that representatives elected directly by the natives themselves were so seated. In this case it was through a pyramid of native councils—village, subdistrict, district, and then the council for the entire colony.

In Nyasaland, an adjoining colony likewise under the Foreign Office, two Indians and two Africans, nominated by their own groups to the Gov-

ernor and then appointed by him, took their seats also in 1949 in the Legislative Assembly of the colony. In the cases of Nyasaland as well as of Northern Rhodesia, legislative assemblies are advisory and consultory rather than powers in themselves.

Also in the several other colonies and dependencies of Great Britain these general policies of hearing and consulting with the natives are followed. These include Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika (mandated), British Somaliland, Nigeria, Togoland (mandated), the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, and the protectorates of Basutoland, Swaziland, and Bechuanaland. The participation by natives in government is more advanced in Kenya, Nigeria, the Gold Coast, and Sierra Leone than in others. In the protectorates the Native Assemblies largely determine policies and legislation.

INDIRECT RULE

The principle of Indirect Rule is widely, even though not universally, employed by several of the colonial governments. Under Indirect Rule the hereditary chiefs are recognized, or one from a number of acceptable candidates is selected. Usually these surround themselves with a few counsellors. To the chief is entrusted authority to decide on the many questions of common administration, such as allocation of lands, making of local roads, and the like. Also he judges, alone, or with his helpers, in most civil cases, and in the first hearings of criminal cases. He directs the collection of taxes, usually through a clerk. The chiefs are paid stipends. In some instances there is usually a chest paid into from special levies, the funds of which are to be expended within the tribe for general benefit.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

Important as is the formal literary education which we have briefly sketched as provided for and going forward in most parts of Africa, very important and crucially necessary likewise as fitting peoples to participate actively in a democracy is the practical, everyday industrial and technological education of the natives that is almost universally going forward day by day throughout the continent.

The Israelites departed from Egypt, a nation of trained workmen and expert technicians. And even though that generation largely fell in the wilderness, enough skill persisted and was passed on from father to son to enable them to make a good start in building their new nation.

In the case of Africa the peoples have remained more or less within their own land. The instructors have come in from the outside. Every

foreigner, man and woman, has been a teacher. Would to God that the social and ethical teaching and example, not to mention the spiritual, had been the best known in the lands these tens of thousands came from, rather than too often the worst!

The Africans, quite unconsciously, no doubt, but actually, are enrolled in a vast, comprehensive school of modern industrial life; and by and large, they are apt pupils. It needs to be noted that the Africans came to this initiation into the modern industrial era with a very considerable measure of preparation. In their primitive life were found the rudiments, some of them well advanced, of most of the crafts and arts—gardening, building, smelting of iron and copper, blacksmithing, weaving, pottery, sculpturing, decorating, what not. Their political and social activities were varied, but reasonably effective. Elements of democratic procedure were far from unknown. Being thoroughgoing animists, their greatest lack was in the realm of the spirit.

The excellent innate capabilities of the African are declared loudly by the activities and responsibilities he now carries. There is no line of governmental, military, industrial, commercial or social organization or activity in which the African does not outnumber the Europeans several fold. In few, if any, of these lines does he at present occupy the top places. Not from his own insistence, but because he is able to function acceptably and because he can do acceptable work at lower costs, he is being advanced step by step toward the top places. And even the high executives have at hand in clerks and assistants, Africans whom they have come to esteem and to look to for advice and counsel.

Pages could be filled in particularizing. Take one line, that of gas-powered motors. Perhaps most car owners do their own driving, but officials and executives and an ever-increasing number of others employ chauffeurs. When it comes to trucks, tractors, great mining shovels, bulldozers, G.E. electric engines, overhead cranes and what not, the majority, in some groups all, are driven by Africans.

In some colonies every railroad engine is in the hands of Africans. In certain colonies and countries this is not so, not because the African cannot be trained there for that function, but because the labor unions of whites have been powerful enough to reserve this and other lines of desirable employment for Europeans (whites), only. In South Africa, notably, the color bar has been erected in regard to a number of skilled trades; and the tendency to do likewise in some of the colonies is showing itself.

DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION

Taking into account the total life in Africa, political, industrial, social, religious, it is probably in the Protestant, the Evangelical churches, that the African has the best opportunity and the greatest freedom to exercise the essential democratic trends of his nature. Protestants generally are avowedly and determinedly democratic in theory and in practice. The Ethiopian movement in South Africa at the turn of the century arose mainly from a tendency, largely unrealized, quite surely, to keep the emerging indigenous church too long in leading strings. Wisdom was widely acquired from that experience.

Generally the Protestant missionaries soon came to see that the true success to arise from their labors is to work themselves eventually out of their job. The aim and the goal is the erection and the development of a self-supporting, self-governing, self-propagating church. The early missionaries of The Methodist Church deliberately planted the seed thought, notably in Japan but also in other countries, that when ready for it, there should come to realization a National Methodist Church. Other Protestant missions have followed the same procedure. If in the beginning there was any thought to tie the groups of believers, the emerging indigenous church in mission lands, into a permanent subserviency to the ecclesiastical body or control in the sending country, very generally if not entirely that policy, so far as Protestants are concerned, has been abandoned. The worldwide swing or movement toward democracy has made such a policy outdated. The inherent spirit of ethnic pride everywhere, notably awakened and much developed by the two World Wars, and manifesting itself in nationalism, will not tolerate such continuing subserviency.

The African is capable of participation from the early days in the administration of the infant church. Take an instance from a mission station where there is a training institution. There is a Principal, of course, usually a missionary. The church of the station is duly organized: the official board made up largely of the elderly members, men and women, is charged with matters of discipline. There is a pastor, who is pastor indeed, not a mere figurehead. It is his duty to preside. Difficult cases come up; involved often is the observance or application of ancient tribal customs. There is a body of customs amounting to laws, in the main commendable. What should be brought over and worked into Christian procedure? What rejected? Paul's injunction was "Abhor that which is evil, cleave to that which is good." The application of Christian principles is

not always clear. Many a time they are inclined to send for the Principal to come and "cut the matter." They are often quite ready in difficult cases to "pass the buck" to the missionary. But on his refusal to take over the case, and his insistence that they stay by in the case, praying and deliberating, it is wonderful the way they usually come out to completely commendable decisions.

In the annual conferences in Methodism, and in corresponding bodies in other denominations, the number of national voting members ere long is greater than the number of missionaries. The participation of these nationals in committee work, in debates and considerations in the governing bodies, is on a high level. Indisputably, guidance could be withdrawn too soon. But the evidence of growing ability is heartening.

COMPETING FORCES

Naturally the question is posed, what groups, what ideologies besides Protestantism are bidding for the spiritual life, for the loyalty of the Africans? Three may be named: Romanism, Islam, Communism.

The Roman Catholic Church is present, and usually aggressive, practically everywhere throughout Africa. Her numbers and power vary greatly according to circumstances. The purpose of the hierarchy at Rome and of its agencies to control even governments in accordance with her proclaimed function and right to be the supreme authority on earth in every phase of life, is evidenced in Africa to the fullest extent it finds possible.

It is utterly beside the mark to judge the Roman hierarchy as to its policy and purposes and activities throughout the world by the lives of peaceful, often spiritual, Roman Catholic neighbors here in America.

Has Rome been known ever to bless a government that was established and was proceeding successfully on democratic lines? Is it not possible at the moment to cite nations that were striving to build up a democratic government but which have had foisted upon them absolute and reactionary dictatorships, at the instance and with the backing of Rome?

If Rome's great aim and endeavor and her achievements were to lead people to become true Christians instead of merely gaining numbers in her church; if she strove to make men truly free instead of merely bringing more under her totalitarian regime, we could wish her well. But to the extent that Rome gains and extends in Africa, as elsewhere, democracy suffers and is hindered.

Islam is autocratic and domineering in essence and in practice. Its forces wiped out a numerous Christian Church in North Africa. In the centuries before that calamity, that Church evidently sent missionaries along any existing routes in the west, and particularly up the Nile and westward across the continent south of the wastes of the Sahara; and there resulted in that region a line of Christian churches which grew to considerable numbers and strength. Islam also crossed the Sahara and gained such power that it ruled. Typically here again, with intense hatred it set upon the Christian communities and wrought great slaughter. It took strong military campaigns within the last century by the British, the Germans, and the French to arrest and to break the destructive power of Islam in that region.

Perhaps the climactic illustration of the madness a Moslem ruler was inclined to exercise against peoples who do not bow to the Crescent is that of the Mahdi in the region of the present Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, who in the days of Gordon of Khartoum did to death more than two million people of that unhappy land. Certainly no people in the possible line of Islam's advance should have been left the sole choice to bow down to that standard or to die. But we would not withhold from Islam recognition of her disregard, whether complete or approximate, of race and color within her groups. May Protestants greatly speed up their progress toward the realization of that goal!

In resisting the advance of Islam in the centuries of her aggression in Africa and Europe, and later in the campaign of the Crusades, the "Christian" forces quite certainly did not hesitate to meet cruelty and ruthlessness with like tactics. The use of the sword as a means of religious conquest has now ceased. But "every Moslem trader is a missionary" is no idle statement. From the more advanced peoples south of the Sahara, traders by the thousands are infiltrating the impressionable tribes to the south, and they are winning many converts. These traders go in groups. They give flattering attention to the headmen of villages and to the chiefs of districts. As they win these to their faith, or at least gain their favor, the village and the district come largely under the influence of Islam. The Christian forces find it much more difficult to win converts where Islam has once become established. But the Moslem leaders are not resting content with any casual method of extending their religion and their power. The Azhar University in Cairo has been enlarged and during the past few years fully several thousands of graduates, or trainees, of that institution have been sent southward into many parts of Africa, particularly toward the

open fields of Central Africa. Probably the students were drawn in from these same regions. This advance is made and maintained entirely by the methods of self-support through trading and other industrial activities.

All peoples at present without a knowledge of the gospel of Christ should speedily be evangelized by Evangelicals and provided with liberally administered schools. The present governmental control of Africa ensures freedom for Evangelicals to press their programs almost everywhere. To this there are admittedly a few areas in which that freedom is much restricted.

Lastly, we consider *Communism* the latest comer and the most aggressive ever of aspirants for world domination. It has been affirmed that "in no country that is predominantly, or strongly Protestant, has Communism gained control." But Communism is aggressively active practically everywhere. To multiplied tens, if not hundreds, of millions in different parts of the world it amounts to a religion, and comes to be their only religion. As such it is displacing weak, worn-out, discredited faiths, or a condition of no faith. Communism *promises* the correcting of patent inequalities and disabilities in current world life and conditions. It has not yet been demonstrated that Communism is fulfilling those promises to the real and abiding satisfaction of any national group.

Communism has cells in several parts of Africa. Its advance can well be checked by the Evangelical Christian forces through a much more active and extended evangelism and the betterment of the economic and social conditions of African peoples.

CONCLUSIONS

A reassuring factor of great promise for the future is the existence and the growing power of the United Nations. While not avowedly religious in its essential functions, it is built on democratic principles. It is committed to promoting and preserving freedom for the individual and for peoples. It declares its interest in the undeveloped lands, and it stands ready to attempt to restrain aggression against the backward peoples and the small and weaker nations. There is great and urgent need to guard against the exploiting of the labor of Africans and of the resources of the continent, mainly to the enrichment of capitalists of other countries, with little or no permanent benefit for the peoples of Africa.

The peoples of the world want peace. One interpretation of the song of the angels on that initial Christmas night is that peace is to be realized among men of good will. And men to be of good will must be free men.

None of the above-mentioned three totalitarian systems has as an objective the leading of men to become people of love, of good will. However faultily some of the groups may be fulfilling their commission, that of making the gospel of God known, the declared objective of the Evangelicals, particularly of the Protestants of the world, is to lead people to love God supremely, and to love one's fellow man as himself.

Notable were the words of General MacArthur in 1945 on the occasion that marked the end of fighting in World War II, that the problem of making genuine peace in the world was a theological, a spiritual problem. Other men charged with military duties, as well as able men in practically all walks of life, have declared, and with emphasis, the same great truth.

During the past century, and notably in the past four decades, the Evangelicals of the world have been drawn into a definite and ever closer fellowship. There is a unitive principle and force in the Protestant or Evangelical faith. This grouping would include the Eastern and some of the Orthodox Churches. Beginning in 1854, gatherings or conferences on missionary work were held on both sides of the Atlantic. These chiefly gave opportunity for fellowship and for the interchange of opinions on a few points. The "Ecumenical" Missionary Conference held in New York in 1900 was valuable for the information gathered and for the inspiration it afforded.

In preparation for the World Missionary Conference to be held in Edinburgh in 1910 an International Committee was formed. Eight commissions during two years of study formulated recommendations to be considered by that Conference. Out of this Conference came a Continuation Committee, which functioned effectively until it was superseded in 1920 by The International Missionary Council. In 1950 thirty-one national councils constituted its membership, divided about equally between councils or organizations of missionary boards in sending countries and national councils in mission lands. Important world gatherings have been held, notably at Jerusalem in 1928 and at Madras in 1938. Mainly as a result of the forces thus set in operation, there has come into existence the World Council of Churches. This organization began to function actually in January, 1939, on the formation of a committee to carry on, as it did actively and fruitfully until the formal organization could be effected. This consummation was reached in 1948.

In 1948 the International Missionary Council initiated *A New Study of the Missionary Obligation of the Church*. The results of this study are expected to be available by 1952. This will indicate the colossal size of

the task that confronts the Christian Church. The urgency of the situation in Africa will be a part of that statement. Significantly in November, 1950, there came into realization the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. This is in process of mobilizing into a unified organization with a General Staff, the several effective agencies through which the major churches of America have been productively operating.

Certainly a clamant challenge confronts the Evangelicals of the world. And the currents of life and the ranks of the opposing forces are not stationary. The world is not standing at attention on parade. For the Church of God to sit at ease in Zion in this fateful day can be but wishful hoping, a trifling with the great Commission.

Motives play a predominant part in life. What motive should stir us? To protect our dearest interests, which indeed are at stake, what can move the Evangelical forces to adequate action? Not many years ago millions enrolled to fight, to work, to die, to make the world safe for democracy. An impelling motive to move and to enlist men has been and is to ensure peace throughout the world, peace for us in our day, and peace for our posterity. Is there any realistic promise, or assurance of peace, other than to extend democracy actively and in a way to be well grounded, throughout the world? And is there any means known other than the evangelical gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, which will produce properly functioning members of democracies?

"The love of Christ constraineth me" should be the sufficient motive of the Christian to lead him to engage wholeheartedly in a very active evangelizing movement, in an aggressive worldwide missionary campaign. But the large majority of Christians are still in spiritual youth. The love they know needs alerting, needs informing, needs increasing, needs definite guidance. Too few of the enrolled church members have been led on to the act of full surrender of self and of all that one has to Christ. Consequently they have failed to experience the joyful and soul-satisfying infilling and the continuing indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Thus they lack victory in their lives, and the motivation of love to others, and adequate power in their service.

Admittedly, only a fraction, and a small one at that, of the potential forces of the Christian Church is mobilized and operative for the Kingdom. The large majority of avowed Christians are only slightly informed as to the world situation and the needs. Generally there is a willingness, a desire to know the facts, and a fair degree of readiness to respond. May the days

ahead see a wide and adequate acquainting of the members of the Evangelical Churches with the essential facts.

As a suggestion, there is urgent need that the missionary forces, particularly abroad, be doubled immediately. That would bring the present work relatively near to being well staffed. It would relieve the killing overstrain under which all too many of the best, the most effective, the particularly precious workers are staggering.

Then at the earliest possible moment there should be again a doubling in personnel and in the means of the then ongoing program. This would make possible the yet greater strengthening and a greatly needed enlargement of the evangelistic, the educational, and other phases of the present work. Practically everywhere there are ranges of untouched needs and of opportunities right at hand which with present resources of staff and of means it is impossible to touch. And beyond these are vast reaches of only slightly touched, and unentered, fields.

And then, what? For the present we will rest the case there. When these advances are made, with the information then at hand, the future steps will be clearly indicated. The World Council of Churches *is* world-wide in scope. The International Missionary Council *is* actively functioning, and among other lines of work is making a study of the present missionary task in the world. The National Council of Churches in the U. S. A. *is* now set to mobilize yet more fully and effectively the resources of Evangelical forces of America.

May there not fail of realization, and that soon, the greatly needed enlargement of the missionary program in Africa!

The Great Divide: Experience Versus Tradition

CECIL NORTHCOTT

THE GREAT DIVIDE of the Christian religion is not in church order or government, not in the denominations and their particular creeds. It is far deeper. It lies in religion itself. Divisions are, it is true, perpetuated by organization, but they are not created by organizations—at least not the big divisions. There are plenty of “splits,” secessions, break-aways inside church organizations which are created by the foolishness of men, their sin and pride; but most secessions happen because there is a big question somewhere unsolved. And that question is usually right on the great divide itself. Is religion an *experience*, or is it a *tradition*? Is it a personal business, something you *know*, or is it to be accepted on authority from the Church? In other words the great divide is the one which separates the Evangelical from the Catholic, the religion of experience from the religion of tradition.

I have been led to meditate on the great divide through the reading of a great and moving book, one of the most notable which has appeared on the history of religion, in English, for some years. I refer to Monsignor Ronald Knox's *Enthusiasm*, which the Oxford Press has recently published. There is a piquancy about this book, for readers in England at least. Ronnie Knox, as he is still known in Oxford, was born in the stern purple of the Anglican evangelical fold. His father was a notable bishop whose two sons, Ronald and Wilfred, followed him in the Christian ministry, one to become a Roman and the other an Anglo-Catholic. The bishop was a devout exponent of the evangelical gospel, a fundamentalist in his views of the Bible, and a believer in the necessity of a sound conversion, a sense of sin, and being “a child of grace.” The bishop was one of those who, according to his son's description of religious experience, *knew* religion. He had got it.

So in examining the evangelical religious experience, or as he prefers to call it, the religion of enthusiasm, R. A. Knox is doubly blessed and

REV. CECIL NORTHCOTT, M.A., is General Secretary of the British United Council for Missionary Education, and Editor of the Edinburgh House Press. His article is based on the theme of Monsignor Ronald Knox's recent book, *Enthusiasm* (Oxford University Press, 1950).

qualified. He knows both sides of the great divide, and to that qualification he adds an eminent fairness as a religious historian and a witty style, all of which make his book a rich offering. He confines his examination to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries chiefly, and rightly gives a large section to Wesley and Methodism which he obviously regards as the high noon of enthusiasm in religion. But he starts with St. Paul's letters to the Corinthians, proceeds through the early Christian years, into the Middle Ages, then gives us comprehensive studies on Jansenism, Quietism, the various French exponents of enthusiasm, then Moravianism; and after the examination of Wesley and Methodism there is a lively chapter on Modern Revivalism.

Knox sees through his study of church history a recurrent theme, not always repeated in the same manner but strong enough to be powerful and regulative. It is the stream of religious enthusiasm bearing its sometimes weird and variegated band of enthusiasts. He says:

You have a clique, an *élite*, of Christian men and (more importantly) women, who are trying to live a less worldly life than their neighbours; to be more attentive to the guidance (directly felt, they would tell you) of the Holy Spirit. More and more, by a kind of fatality, you see them draw apart from their co-religionists, a hive ready to swarm. . . . Then, while you hold your breath and turn away your eyes in fear, the break comes; condemnation or secession, what difference does it make? A fresh name has been added to the list of Christianities.

That is how it happens. It is an experience repeated again and again since Luther shook the world. But Luther can hardly be held solely responsible for it. The origin of enthusiasm lies deeper. It lies in the make-up of Christianity itself and the response it claims from the human heart. Wesley called it "heart work," but there were many before him who knew that real religion meant an answer from a man personally, rather than the mechanical agreement to what authority and tradition believed and agreed to on his behalf. St. Paul faced a bout of enthusiasm in Corinth, and, according to Knox, hardly knew what to make of it. He feared that the Corinthians were over-occupied with *charismata* and therefore wrote his great chapter on charity (I Cor. 13) in order to show that

. . . charity is the bond which unifies the organic body of Christendom. Useless to ask whether we are speaking of a supernatural quality or of a moral virtue, for it is both. What St. Paul evidently fears, is that an unwholesome preoccupation with the *charismata* in their more startling forms is creating an atmosphere uncongenial to the exercise of charity; it fosters pride, jealousy, backbiting, and other uncharitable emotions. History has vindicated his fears.

Even in the Middle Ages, when the authority of the Catholic Church

held the western world in a unity, this quality of "enthusiasm" in the Christian religion flared up. The Waldensian Church in Italy today is a result of one of its eruptions, and a sign, too, that experience can run into tradition, and that the rebels in religion can be organized into respectable institutionalists. In the Waldensian case their church has become a kind of Protestant outpost in a Catholic country, an enthusiastic legacy of vital religious experience. Elsewhere in Europe there were the Hussites, the Brethren of the Free Spirit, the Catharists, and in Britain the Lollards and Wycliffe. Condemned by the Church as heresies, these eruptions were in part protests against authority, and in part witnesses to this strain of enthusiasm which runs through Christianity. Knox comments:

Viewed at its best, the movement we are considering was a protest on behalf of simplicity in an age which had begun to feel the oppression of worldliness. The Middle Ages suffered from a growing nostalgia for the Sermon on the Mount. Indeed it is permissible to suggest that if St. Francis had lived a century earlier, there would have been no Waldenses, and the Catharists would have lost their market. . . . Because the age, compared with those which had gone before it, seemed an artificial one, the medieval heretics struck, everywhere, the note of simplicity.

Most of the medieval enthusiasts would have wished to stay within the Church as a movement of reform; but once the fire is lit it is not easy to control unless ecclesiastical power stamps it out, as it so often did, with the aid of the secular arm. In the cases however of St. Francis and St. Ignatius, the Church was shrewd enough to see that their movements were not petty eruptions on the surface of the ecclesiastical landscape, but genuine convulsions of the spirit which should be directed rather than repressed. How different the history of enthusiasm would be if the eighteenth-century Church of England had been alert enough to understand the phenomenon of Wesley!

Descending into the underworld of Cromwellian England, Knox sees the giant figure of George Fox:

Allow, if you will, for a certain amount of exaggeration when he tells you, in the *Journal*, how instantaneous were the effects of his preaching, how easily he put his adversaries to silence; discount the egotism, if you can call it egotism, of a man wholly absorbed in his mission. Remember only that this is a man full of scruples and questionings in his youth, who without any agonies of conversion has emerged into a state of complete spiritual equilibrium, is sure of himself in all companies and upon all occasions.

Fox's *enthusiasm* was of the very personal kind. He did not set out to find truth, comments Knox, "he'd got it." He was one of the ultra-confident *knowers* to whom God has spoken. "Fox did not theorize about

the inner light, he walked in it, and was not satisfied until he saw others walking in it." There is the kernel of the experience of enthusiasm. Something has happened, and there is something to pass on to others. Wesley had it as well, and planted it deeply into the pattern of evangelical religion.

At the heart of him [says Knox] the Evangelical is always an experimentalist. He feels certain that something has happened to him, and he invites you to let it happen to you—that is, really, the whole of his message. And if he is in a position to assure you that when this experience of conversion befell him it took six strong men to hold him down, you will be less likely (he argues) to suspect that it was just your fancy.

Being a Catholic, Knox is probably more skeptical about the particular Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light than he is of any other aspect of the religion of enthusiasm. He sees it as the enthronement "in dangerous isolation of the truth of God's presence within us," and he compares it with the more regulated mysticism of the Catholic tradition with its careful attention to the Scriptures and theology.

When he approaches Methodism and Wesley, this Catholic historian puts on all his armor of appraisal. Here is *enthusiasm* of the first order, and one which a traditionalist can appreciate because this vital experience did become one of the most important of the new "Christianities," with a capacity for organization and tradition equal to any of the older forms of the faith. Knox however discounts Wesley as an organizer. He views a great organizer as one who trains lieutenants to carry out his plans with a minimum of reference to headquarters. That was not Wesley's manner. He remained to the end as the sole source of authority; but in his conception of the group or society he was an original organizer, and realized that the religion of enthusiasm could best be kept alive in the contagious atmosphere of a like-minded group. Your enthusiast has never been a solitary. He always wishes to pass on his religion, and finds a cell of the fervent necessary not only to their salvation but to his own as well.

While this was not a new phenomenon in the Christian religion, Wesley's ardor in applying it to the landscape of faith gave a new and lasting pattern to the Anglo-American scene. On both sides of the Atlantic the religion of experience became paramount as evidence of real religion. Doctrinal calculations and reasonings about religion faded into insignificance alongside the overwhelming sense of a religion by which you *knew*; which gave you certainty and a joyful aplomb in a world of misery and passing shadow. In the English-speaking world Wesley's "heart work" was the mark of a warm, impulsive faith which outshone the cold niceties of eighteenth-century deism. But the Wesleyan revolution was no period

piece which had its day and joined the collection of eccentricities in religion. It was not just another Christianity. It was the faith itself. Wesley finally set the coping stones on the walls of the great divide. Since his day the modern world has known very clearly the difference between the religion of experience and the religion of tradition, between the authentic fire and the faint embers which institutional religion keeps aglow in spite of its seeming frigidity. That is not to say that the "official church" has not got religion, and that only the enthusiast possesses it. No. Even Wesley was a child of the official church to the end of his days, and was a witness to the fact that he found religion in her sacraments and traditions. The church, as Knox points out, carries current coin as well as obsolete doubloons in her treasury, and it is the current coin which, after all, the enthusiast takes out, trades in, and through it brings home fresh riches for the soul.

That was Wesley's gift. He used the current coin which had been circulating for many years through the French preachers and the Moravians and made it available for the ordinary man to use. The time was ripe for enthusiasm. In one sense, of course, Wesley was original. It was his revolution. In another he was only expanding the evangelical experience which was dormant in the Christian faith, and which needed bringing out in the light of day where it would flourish in the sunshine. He realized, however, that it could not flourish in isolation, but needed some form or institution to save it from the vaporings and imaginings of the sectarian. Wesley was a churchman, and the ultimate form of his enthusiasm was an ecclesiastical one which puts Wesley in the company of Luther and Calvin rather than of Fox and Fénelon.

But Wesley like all the great enthusiasts was an experimentalist, and it is this note which marks the evangelical side of the great divide, in all types of enthusiasm from St. Augustine down to the latest form of revivalism. There is bound to be exaggeration in all this. It may be argued that St. Augustine himself in his natural overanxiety to rout the Pelagian heresy, which doubted the mystery of redemption, painted too deep and too gloomy the world-picture of heaven, hell, sin, punishment and grace. He opened the door to many lesser enthusiasts who have built on his foundations their own exaggerated emphases. Augustine is the classical background for all revivalism, but he is not to be blamed for what happens when his theology is distorted. It is inevitable that new movements of the spirit should be out of balance when compared with traditional Christianity, for they usually seize on some neglected point of faith, or experience, lift it into prominence, and sometimes elevate it out of all proportion to

the rest of the faith. That is the peril of enthusiasm; but is it not a risk which Christianity has to take, even though it means sharpening the heights of the great divide? Does not the Holy Spirit work this way? Does not the evidence of Christian history show that, although enthusiasm often creates fresh divisions, it also provides fresh life and the impetus of a new drive in religion?

But does the Christian faith stand or fall by an experience? Bishop Butler's famous remark to John Wesley, "Sir, the pretending to extraordinary revelations and gifts of the Holy Ghost is a horrid thing, a very horrid thing," sounds as if Butler was failing to read the signs of the times, and was merely condemning Wesley. Butler was no fool, however, although he was not a Wesley. He realized that Wesley's challenge shook not only the fabric of the traditional church, but the very basis of the faith itself. Could there be religion without experience? Butler knew, in spite of the seeming deadness of the eighteenth-century church, that the answer was "Yes." In the life of the church, its sacraments, its prayers, its liturgy and its mystic insights, there was experience. Different, of course, from that of the enthusiast with his concern for a personal experience of grace, of sins forgiven, and of final assurance established, but experience nevertheless. Knox offers a distinction between "evangelical enthusiasm" and the "mystical enthusiasm" of tradition.

I would suggest a distinction between "mystical" and "evangelical" enthusiasm. One taking its point of departure from the Incarnation, rather than the Atonement, by-passes the theology of grace and concentrates on the God within; not repelling, necessarily, the Unitarian. The other, more acutely conscious of man's fallen state, thinks always in terms of redemption; to know, somehow, that your sins are forgiven, that you are a new creature in God's sight, is all that matters. Call the two tendencies, if you will, Platonist and Aristotelian, Johannine and Pauline, Scotist and Thomist, but all such distinctions will fall short of exactitude. "Mystical" and "evangelical" will serve our purpose best.

This is another way of stating what the great divide in the Christian faith is in terms of experience, and it is a useful analysis particularly in a day, such as our own, when the evangelical experience is less common, and many who owe their personal religion to it are frustrated at its nonrecurrence in the manner they are familiar with. One fact about evangelical experience is always true. It cannot be manufactured, or stirred up artificially. It happens. But during the period of waiting for a revival of this experience, ought we not to regard the continuing life of the church, and the experience it offers, as authentic experience? Each side of the great divide has its enthusiasm, equally valid and vital. We ought not to fall into the mistake

of regarding, say, the evangelical experience as more religious than the traditional church experience, which is personal and inward to so many millions of Christians who have never had Wesley's "heart work" or walked in Fox's "inner light." The modern Christian is more often than not a traditionalist, and a churchman in religious experience. He is suspicious of revivalism and of enthusiasm which appears to be heady and ill-founded. That may be a sign that he needs the special visitation of the classical enthusiasts before he is able to leap a little higher, and display in word and deed some evidence that he has really *got* religion. But for many, the life of the church is that evidence. They do not need the further *imprimatur* of an evangelical experience. They have it all on their side of the divide.

It was significant that at the 1949 Bangkok Conference of East Asian Christian leaders, they should put at the top of their lists of concerns the need for an effective liturgy of the church. They felt that only an unshakable inner life of the church and churchmanship was capable of facing the onslaughts of paganism in all its forms. Would your great enthusiast be satisfied with that plan of campaign? He would be more at home, perhaps, in the evangelism plans for East Asia, and would be surprised at seeing traditional churchmen alongside him. Does that mean that the modern church is capable of bridging the great divide? Shall we see in our time a start being made on the merging of the two great traditions of Christendom? There are signs, I suggest, that the Holy Spirit is busy on the job.

“
on
to
m
m
m
ol
C
no
th
C
ar
Ca
lu
an
rei
Er
Ch
ore

wh
tio
wh
has
a r
ret
way

Wa
Boo
here
caus

Anglican Recognition of Presbyterian Ordinations

A Step Toward the Reconstitution of a True Catholicism

GEORGE J. CLEAVELAND

"CATHOLIC" IS TOO GREAT a word to be granted exclusively as of right to any sect within the Holy Catholic Church. The word belongs to all Christians. In the early centuries of the life of the Church, Catholic meant universal, and later orthodox as opposed to heterodox. It never meant papal or Roman as opposed to nonpapal or non-Roman. No ecumenical council of orthodox Christendom ever understood the word Catholic to mean Roman or conciliar catholicism subject to papalism. The Catholicism of the first six centuries was biblical, patristic, and conciliar—not Roman absolutism or papalized conciliarism. The Church of England, the Protestant Episcopal Church, and all other churches within the Anglican Communion are biblical, patristic, and conciliar Catholic churches. They are also Protestant churches asserting that biblical, patristic, and conciliar Catholicism is the true catholicism; and that the dominance of papal absolutism over conciliar catholicism is noncatholic and contrary to the faith and polity of the Church as held in the days of her visible unity. In the reigns of Elizabeth, James I, Charles I and Charles II, the Church of England recognized the German, Swiss, Scottish and French Reformed Churches as true churches within the Holy Catholic Church having valid orders. There has never been legal Anglican repudiation of that position.

The initial post-1662 reordination of presbyterially ordained clergy who came into the Anglican ministry was based not on a theological repudiation of presbyterial ordination but upon political and pragmatic causes which have long since passed away. Since that justification for reordination has disappeared and since a war-torn world requires the united witness of a redeeming church, the time has come for the Anglican communion to return to the faith and attitude of its great reforming divines and lead the way in the reconstitution of a true catholicism by making an open, unre-

THE REV. GEORGE J. CLEAVELAND is Canon Librarian of Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., and is co-author with the Rev. John W. Suter of *The American Book of Common Prayer, Its Origin and Development* (Oxford, 1949). He shows here that one historic barrier between the Anglican and other churches had "pragmatic causes which have long since passed away."

served, forthright acknowledgment of the catholic status and validity of the presbyterially ordained ministries of the Reformed and the Methodist Churches. These churches, like the Church of England, are Protestant churches, and like the Church of England they are also Reformed *Catholic* churches; that is, they are true parts and portions of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Like the *Reformed Catholic* Church of England, or the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, they object to the papalization of conciliar catholicism, deny such nonbiblical, nonpatristic, and nonconciliar doctrines as enforced clerical celibacy, transubstantiation, indulgences, equation of unwritten ecclesiastical tradition with written Scripture as bases for doctrine, papal infallibility, immaculate conception and bodily assumption of the Blessed Virgin, all of which Tridentine or Post-Tridentine Romanism has added to the Catholic Faith.

The validity of the orders of the presbyterially ordained clergy of the reformed churches of Germany, Scotland, France, Switzerland and the Low Countries was recognized as valid by the great reformers and defenders of the Church of England on the same basis that many present-day Anglican and Protestant Episcopal scholars and clergy acknowledge or are ready to acknowledge them. These orders were accepted on the ground that "presbyter" and "bishop" originally were two different names for the same official and that those names are so used in the New Testament. They were accepted as valid on the ground that presbyters once possessed the right of ordination in certain sections of the church and exercised that right apart from any bishop, and that although the exercise of the right of presbyterial ordination was curtailed and regulated by canon, yet that canonical regulation did not disprove presbyterial ordination or destroy the validity thereof. Men so ordained were accepted as valid presbyters upon submission to the Church of England, acceptance of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, and their promise to read the same publicly in the church. Their orders were accepted also on the ground that a church within a nation has the right and duty to alter its discipline when circumstances make such alteration imperative, and that when circumstances so require, ordination by a college or commission of presbyter-bishops is as valid as ordination by a bishop with presbyters who have surrendered their right to ordain apart from the episcopate.

Therefore, the Church of England during the Reformation from the time of Cranmer to the days of Laud admitted the episcopally and the presbyterially ordained priests of the Reformed Churches to her ministry without reordination. Of apostolic succession, as urged by Fisher, the Jesuit, Laud wrote: "for succession in the general I shall say this; it is a

great happiness where it may be had visible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find anyone of the ancient Fathers that makes local, personal, visible, and continued succession a necessary mark or sign of the true Church in any one place.”¹ In one instance such recognition by the Church of England of the validity of presbyterial ordination was followed by consecration to the episcopate without reordination to the presbyterate.

Such recognition of the validity of the presbyterial ordinations of the Reformed Churches by the Church of England continued until 1662. At the Restoration in the time of Charles II, the Canon Law and the Preface to the Ordinal were altered to make it impossible for men with presbyterial ordination or congregational ordination to serve in the Church of England. Even to this there were exceptions, and presbyterial ordination within the Church of England continued among the clergy on one of the Channel Islands, canonically under the Diocese of Winchester, even down to the nineteenth century. The change in Canon Law concerning recognition of presbyterial ordinations was made in order to rule out incumbents in English parishes who were opposed to the return of episcopacy. The Church of England realized that these men who had held the parishes during the Interregnum and who opposed the return of episcopacy and the Liturgy must be expelled or caused to submit before any real restoration could be accomplished. The withdrawal of recognition was not a repudiation of the validity of presbyterially ordained clergy within their own portions of the Church Catholic, but a preservative measure adopted for purposes of domestic ecclesiastical security. It was not a reversal of past recognition of the validity of the presbyterially ordained priests of the Reformed Churches but a pragmatic measure, the need for which no longer exists.

That this alteration of the Canon Law and the Preface to the Ordinal was not intended as a repudiation of the validity of presbyterial ordination within the national Reformed Churches is seen by the fact that in 1662, during the reign of Charles II, the son of Peter du Molin was instituted rector of Adisham and Staple in Kent without reordination under the saving clause of the Act of Uniformity which read: “That the penalties in this Act shall not extend to foreigners or aliens of the foreign Reformed Churches allowed, or to be allowed by the King’s Majesty, his heirs or successors in England.” This shows that objection to presbyterial orders in 1662 was a legal and not an ecclesiastical matter. Presbyterial orders conveyed in England were rejected; presbyterial orders conveyed outside

¹ *Laud’s Conference with Fisher, the Jesuit*, Section 29, vii. J. H. Parker, Oxford, 1899.

England were admitted. After the Tractarian Movement which began with Keble's Assize sermon in 1833, a narrower interpretation began to be placed on the concept of ministerial validity.

The sixteenth-century renewal of the ancient right of the presbyter to ordain derived from the identity of presbyter and bishop in the New Testament. In Acts 20:17 St. Paul mentions the presbyters (τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους), to whom in verse 28 he says "the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops" (ἐπισκόπους). In Titus 1:4-7 we read that St. Paul directs Titus to ordain presbyters (πρεσβυτέρους) in every city in Crete and select blameless men, for the bishop (ὁ ἐπίσκοπος) must be blameless. To the fact that in the New Testament presbyter and bishop are interchangeable names for the same individual, many outstanding scholars of the Church have borne witness. The Roman Catholic liturgist, Morinus, has said, "Episcopi et Presbyteri una ordinato est." The Abbé Duchesne has stated: "The collegiate body of priests, or the collegiate episcopate, long retained the power of ordination which now characterizes the episcopal dignity. The priests of Alexandria in replacing their dead bishop not only elected but consecrated his successor."² Richard Field (1561-1616), Dean of Gloucester, historian and theologian, admitted the essential identity of bishop and presbyter in all things including *order*. In his book *Of the Church*³ he quotes Durandus, papal theologian and fourteenth-century Bishop of Meaux, who said:

Touching the power of consecration or order it is much doubted of among divines, whether any be greater therein than an ordinary presbyter: for Hierome seemeth to have been of opinion that the highest power of consecration or order is the power of a priest or elder; so that every priest, in respect of his priestly power, may minister all sacraments, confirm the baptized, give all orders, all blessings and consecrations, etc.

On page 217 of the same book and chapter, Richard Field writes of bishops:

. . . none may ordain but they (bishops) only unless it be in cases of extreme necessity, as when all bishops are extinguished by death, or, fallen into heresy, obstinately refuse to ordain men to preach the Gospel of Christ sincerely. And then as the care and charge of the Church is devolved to the presbyters remaining catholic, so likewise the ordaining of men to assist them, and succeed them in the work of the ministry.

This concept was held by James Ussher (1581-1665), Archbishop of Armagh, who wrote: "I have ever declared my opinion to be that *episcopus et presbyter gradu tantum differunt non ordine*, and consequently that in places where bishops can not be had, the ordination of presbyters standeth

² Duchesne, L., *Early History of the Church*. Longmans, Green & Co., 1915, p. 69.

³ Book V, chap. xxvii, p. 216.

valid." Before James Ussher's archiepiscopate his predecessor in office, Richard Ledred, once Bishop of Ossory and Chancellor of the University of Oxford and in 1347 Archbishop of Armagh, wrote: "If all the bishops were dead at one and the same time, the minor priests would be able as bishops to ordain and even to consecrate."⁴

The equation of presbyter and bishop acknowledged by the Schoolmen and others is also admitted by more modern Anglican scholars. Dr. Edwin Hatch, in his *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, writes:⁵

Now in the Christian communities there appears to have been from very early times a body of officers: it must be inferred from the identity of the names which were employed that those officers were in relation to the Christian communities what the Senate was in relation to the municipality, and what the committee was in reference to an association. They were both known collectively by a name which is common in both relations,—that of *ordo*: they were known individually as well as collectively by a name which was common to the members of the Jewish *συνέδρια* and to the members of the Greek *γερούσιαι* of Asia Minor—that of *πρεσβύτεροι*: they were also known—for I shall here assume the weight of evidence has rendered it practically indisputable—by the name *ἐπίσκοποι*.

In his book *The Church and Christian Reunion*, Headlam has quoted J. B. Lightfoot as saying:⁶

It is a fact now generally recognized by theologians of all shades of opinion that in the language of the New Testament the same officer in the Church is called indifferently 'bishop' (*ἐπίσκοπος*) and 'elder' (*πρεσβύτερος*).

Of episcopacy Headlam states:

Episcopacy, like all other Church customs, had its roots in apostolic action, but episcopacy as it existed in later days was not the direct result of apostolic action, but was the creation of the Church, which gradually moulded its institutions to fit the altered needs of the times.⁷

In the same work Headlam asserts:

There were no bishops in the monarchical sense in the times covered by the New Testament. The name bishop was a synonym for presbyter, and it remains so at Rome and Corinth shortly before the year 100 A. D., and there is some, but not very considerable evidence for Church government by presbyters during the second century.

Bishops Lightfoot⁸ and Hort⁹ equate presbyter and bishop, and of that equation Lightfoot has written:

⁴ O'Connor, *Columbanus ad Hibernos*, No. VII, Introductory Letter XXVI.

⁵ London, Rivingtons, 1881. Lecture II, p. 38.

⁶ Headlam, A., *The Church and Christian Reunion*. Bampton Lectures; J. Murray, 1920, p. 66, footnote.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁸ Lightfoot, *Philippians*. Macmillan & Co., 1888. Edition 8, pp. 90-95.

⁹ Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, pp. 97-104.

The episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localization but out of the presbyterial order by elevation: and the title which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them.¹⁰

The late Rev. Samuel A. Wallis, Professor of Ecclesiastical Polity and Liturgics in the Protestant Episcopal Seminary in Virginia, tells us, "It is well known that the Schoolmen never considered the episcopate a separate order from the presbyterate, *but a higher degree within the sacerdotium.*"¹¹

The fact that the episcopate is a higher degree within the *sacerdotium* is exceedingly important to note in considering the validity of presbyterial orders conveyed apart from the bishop. If he is a presbyter having a higher degree within the *sacerdotium*, then in conveying presbyterial orders with the presbyters he is acting as chief presbyter, passing on with his brethren their mutual order of priesthood. That presbyters have passed on such orders apart from the bishop is a matter of historic fact, and the conveyance of presbyterial order has been regulated in the fourth century by conciliar decree, authorized by papal action, and acknowledged as valid by the Schoolmen and other later theologians of the Church of England. This is a position which, if assumed by the modern Anglican Churches, offers great hope for a true and genuine reunion of reformed Catholic Churches.

Gradually the early right of the presbyters to ordain apart from bishops passed away, but the exclusive right of the bishop to ordain in the Church of Rome was not authoritatively decreed in that Church until the Council of Trent. Remnants of the presbyterial right to ordain and to admit new members into the presbyterial order in the *sacerdotium* survive in the Ordinals of the Churches in the Anglican Communion. An examination of these Ordinals will reveal that apart from the company of presbyters a bishop can not ordain a presbyter, and that in the ordination of presbyters the assisting presbyters are more than mere witnesses; they are participating agents, of right, joining with their bishop acting as chief presbyter in creating new presbyters and in admitting them into their mutual order of presbyterate within the *sacerdotium* of the Holy Catholic Church. Presbyterial ordination of presbyters apart from the episcopate may be considered ecclesiastically irregular from the present viewpoint of many in the Anglican Communion, but not invalid, if judged by her historic attitude and actions.

A few illustrations of presbyterial ordinations held prior to the sixteenth-century break-up of Western Catholicism may be of interest.

¹⁰ Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

¹¹ Wallis, S. A., *Lectures on Church Policy*. Alexandria, Va., The Barrett Press, 1911, p. 19.

The action of the presbyters of Alexandria in replacing their dead bishop has already been referred to in the quotation from Duchesne. That such presbyterial ordination and consecration continued on into the fourth century and even after, by regulation, is evidenced by the enactment of the following canon by the Council of Ancyra (314 A. D.): "It is not permitted to the chorepiscopi (country bishops) to ordain priests or deacons, *nor even to city presbyters* without the written authority of the bishop of that place." This shows that in Galatia and in Asia Minor up to 314 A. D., city presbyters had ordained and could continue to do so if granted the written permission of the bishop of the city. The canon was not a repudiation but a regulation of the right of presbyterial ordination.

Innocent III (1198) issued a Bull permitting Cistercian abbots to make deacons. By commission of Pope Celestine V (1294-1296) "Francis Apt, a Franciscan Friar, conferred priest's orders on Ludovico, son of King Charles of Sicily." In the rule book of the Abbot Aurelian was written, "Et quando abbas voluerit ordinandi habeat potestatem."¹² Dr. Friedrich Heiler states concerning the Church in Finland, "that clear evidence of early ordination of presbyters survived, in that as late as the eighth century presbyters had been ordained by presbyters, and especially in that to the present day even in the Roman Church all priests who were present laid hands on the ordinandus."¹³ Again, "The priests who were sent to the German tribes as heralds of the faith ordained others to the priesthood and in other ways performed the episcopal functions. Even the Schoolmen still earnestly disputed whether a simple priest might even ordain with papal permission." In the same work Heiler states: "In the year 1400 Boniface IX gave an English Abbot the privilege of ordaining priests, but annulled it in 1403."

ANGLICAN ADMISSIONS OF THE VALIDITY OF THE PRESBYTERIAL ORDINATIONS

To demonstrate the fact that the Church of England, while keeping episcopacy for itself, did not repudiate the validity of presbyterial ordinations within the Reformed Churches, I shall quote from representative bishops and clergy of the Church of England. It should be recalled that prior to 1662, and in some instances thereafter, presbyterially ordained priests of the Reformed Churches were admitted to Anglican cures without reordination. In England clergy presbyterially ordained were looked on

¹² Reed, J. S., *Crosier and Keys*. New York, 1895, p. 254.

¹³ Heiler, F., *Im Ringen um der Kirche*, 1934, p. 486. Quoted from S. P. C. K. Report of Helsingfors Conference, *The Church of England and the Church of Finland*, 1934.

as the product of rebellion against the order of the Established Church, whereas presbyterially ordained priests of the Reformed Churches who came to incorporate themselves within the Church of England were looked on as valid clergy of sister churches. The distinction is important.

The Reverend Dr. De Laune, a French presbyterially ordained clergyman, who had translated the Book of Common Prayer into the French language and who applied for a cure of souls in the Church of England, was received and installed without reordination. To him Bishop Overall said, "Reordination we must not admit no more than rebaptism . . . if you will adventure the order that you have I will admit your presentation and give you institution into the living howsoever." This was done. Thomas Cartwright, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, was ordained by presbyters on the Continent and was accepted without reordination under the Thirteenth Statute of Elizabeth. Walter Travers, ordained in Antwerp by the presbytery there in 1578, was made Provost of Trinity College by Archbishop Loftus, Archbishop of Dublin and Chancellor of Ireland, without reordination. The fact that Archbishop Whitgift silenced the preaching of Travers during his controversy with Hooker was a repudiation not of the validity of Travers' orders, but of his creating ecclesiastical discord.

Morton, Bishop of Durham, received from one of the Reformed Continental Churches a presbyterially ordained presbyter over the opposition of Archbishop Marc Antonio De Dominis. De Dominis, former Roman Catholic Archbishop of Spalatro, who had entered England and embraced the doctrine and discipline of the *Reformed Catholic* Church of England without repudiating his position as a bishop in the Roman segment of the Church, objected to the reception of presbyterially made clergymen, and his objection was overruled. In overruling the former Roman Archbishop, Bishop Morton stated that he could "not consider reordaining the man because it would give scandal to the Reformed Churches." The clergyman was received without reordination. The Reverend Peter Du Molin, French Reformed Pastor, was made chaplain to King James I without reordination and administered the last sacrament to the dying monarch. When Charles II came to the throne, Peter Du Molin's son, also a presbyterially ordained presbyter from the Continent, was installed without reordination in the parish of Adisham and Staple in Kent, under the saving clause of the Act of Uniformity replacing an English presbyterially ordained presbyter.

Note this: Presbyterial ordination bestowed in England was looked

on as illegal and contrary to the Establishment, whereas continental presbyterial ordination was considered the legal and valid action of sister Reformed Catholic Churches. On April 6, 1582, the Most Reverend Edmund Grindal, Archbishop of Canterbury, directed his Vicar General, Dr. Aubrey, to license a presbyterially ordained presbyter, the Reverend John Morrison, D.D., presbyter of the Church of Scotland, giving him authority to preach the Word of God and administer the Sacraments throughout the whole province of Canterbury. The license reads:

Since you, the aforesaid, John Morrison, about five years past in the town of Garrett, in the county of Lothian, of the Kingdom of Scotland, were admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the holy ministry, by the imposition of hands, according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland; and since the congregation of that county of Lothian is conformable to the orthodox faith, and sincere religion now received in this realm of England, and established by public authority: we, therefore, as much as lies in us, and as by right we may, approving and ratifying the form of your ordination and preferment done in such manner aforesaid, grant unto you a license and faculty, with the consent and express command of the Most Reverend Father in Christ, the Lord Edmund, by the Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, to us signified, that in such orders by you taken, you may have power in any convenient places in and throughout the whole province of Canterbury, to celebrate divine offices, to minister the sacraments, etc, as much as in you lies; and we may *de jure*, and as far as the laws of the kingdom do allow.¹⁴

Here is an archiepiscopal acknowledgment of both the validity of the presbyterial orders of Dr. Morrison and the form and rite by which he was ordained.

An outstanding clergyman of his day and a translator of the 1611 Authorized Version of the Holy Bible was the Reverend Dr. Hadrian A. Saravia. Dr. Saravia was a Protestant theologian of Spanish descent. In 1582 he was Professor of Divinity at Leyden. He was buried in Canterbury Cathedral. He wrote a splendid work, *Differences in Ministerial Degrees*; he advocated episcopacy, but was not reordained when received into the ministry of the Church of England. Dr. Saravia was made prebendary of Canterbury and vicar of Lewisham in Kent. He gave Hooker his deathbed communion. His reception without reordination was in line with Anglican procedure. The principle of that procedure has been clearly stated by John Cosin, the high-church bishop of Durham. Cosin wrote:

If at any time a member so ordained in the French churches came to incorporate himself in ours and to receive a public charge or some cure of souls among us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have done so of late, and can

¹⁴ Strype, *Life of Grindal*. Quoted in Reed, J. S., *op. cit.*

instance in many others before my time) our bishops did not reordain him before they admitted him to his charge as they would have done if his former ordination in France had been void.

To Peter Gunning, author of the Prayer for All Sorts and Conditions of Men, John Cosin wrote, quoting the words of Bishop Overall: "Though we are not to lessen the *jus divinum* of episcopacy where it is established and may be had, yet we must take heed that we do not, for want of episcopacy, where it can not be had, cry down and destroy all the Reformed Churches abroad, both in Germany, France, and other places, and say they have neither ministers nor sacraments, but all is void and null that they do."¹⁵

Again to quote Headlam, "Twice in history has reunion been attempted between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, on the basis of restoring episcopacy to Scotland and on both occasions it failed."¹⁶ In 1610 Spottiswoode and two other presbyters presbyterially ordained were sent to England to receive episcopal consecration. Before consecration they were not reordained. In 1661 (during the Restoration under Charles II) Sharp, Fairfowl, Leighton, and Hamilton were consecrated Bishops for Scotland by Gilbert, Bishop of London; George, Bishop of Worcester; Richard, Bishop of Carlisle, and Hugh, Bishop of Llandaff. In this case the newly consecrated bishops were reordained, but in this instance, as in the 1610 instance, the clergy of Scotland were not reordained but continued in their parishes in presbyterial orders.

Keble, in his Preface to Hooker's *Works*, has written:

Nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England, with no better than presbyterian ordination; and it appears by Travers' supplication to the Council that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the Statute 13th of Elizabeth permitting those who had received orders in any other form than that of the English Service Book on giving securities to exercise their calling in England.

Here is what Richard Hooker, the great defender of episcopacy, says:

Now whereas hereupon some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops, which have had their ordination like wise by other bishops before them, till we come to the very apostles of Christ themselves. . . . To this we answer that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop. The whole church visible being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than bishops to ordain; howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways. Men may be extraordinarily, yet, allowably, two ways admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church.

¹⁵ *Works of John Cosin*, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Vol. 4, pub. 1851, pp. 449-450.

¹⁶ Headlam, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

One is, when God himself doth of himself raise up any, whose labour he useth without requiring that men should authorize them. Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep; where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath, nor can have possibly, a bishop to ordain: in case of such necessity the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give place. And, therefore, we are not simply without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination.¹⁷

The statement of Archbishop Whitgift is also to the point.

That any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church can not be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind thought to be more convenient, I utterly deny. I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed or commanded in the Scriptures to the Church of Christ. So that, notwithstanding government or some kind of government, may be a part of the Church as touching the outward form and perfection of it, yet it is not such a part of the essence and being but that it may be the Church of Christ without this or that kind of government."¹⁸

Bishop Hall, Chaplain to Archbishop Laud, said of episcopacy, "It is necessary for the well being, not the being of the Church." Hall's statement reflects Laud's own position, that of John Cosin, that of Hooker, and that of John Jewel as well as many other leading reformers and defenders of the Church of England. The author of *Tract XV*, while stressing the value of episcopacy and holding to apostolic succession as the regular way, looked upon the Reformed Churches as Catholic churches, defending the Faith, and having a ministry derived from "the episcopate in commission." He wrote:

It may be said (in maintaining apostolic succession) that we throw blame on Luther and some of the foreign reformers, who did act without the authority of their bishops. But we reply that it has been always agreeable to the principles of the Church that if a bishop taught and upheld what was contrary to the orthodox faith the clergy and people were not bound to submit, but were obliged to maintain the true religion and if excommunicated by such bishops they were never accounted to be cut off from the Church. The true faith is prior in importance to the Church which is built upon it. Luther and his associates upheld the truth; and though it is not necessary to defend every act of fallible men like them, yet we are justified in maintaining, that their conduct generally in defending it against the Romish party, even in opposition to their episcopal rulers, was worthy of great praise. At the same time it is impossible not to lament that they did not take the first opportunity to place themselves under the orthodox bishops of the apostolic succession. Nothing so far as we can judge was more likely to have preserved their communion from that great decline of religion that has taken place on the Continent, as seems indeed to be a growing feeling among

¹⁷ Hooker, R., *Works*, Book VII, 14. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 7th ed., 1888, p. 231.

¹⁸ Whitgift, J., *Works*. Parker Society, Cambridge University Press, 1851. Vol. I, p. 184.

Lutherans of the present day. Therefore, instead of viewing them as a body formed and settled and therefore at variance with apostolic usage, it is more accurate as well as charitable to consider them as episcopal churches, *sede vacante*, or with the *episcopate in commission*, protesting communities, which have fallen back on their own spiritual rights, and the basis of faith, and are but waiting the time unhappily delayed, when they may complete what is wanting in their own organization and develop themselves into their just and original dimensions.¹⁹

John Wesley had ample justification and precedent for his act of ordaining a superintendent (or bishop) for American Methodists. He was faced by these facts: For 170 years the Church of England had been incapable of granting the episcopate to the Church in the Colonies of North America, and the American victory in the Revolution made it appear doubly impossible for the Church of England to grant the episcopate to the Protestant Episcopal Church; the Bishop of London had declined to ordain one of his clergy and the Primus of Scotland had refused to consecrate Dr. Coke for service in the then nonepiscopal United States of America; Dr. Seabury had spent almost a year vainly trying to secure episcopal consecration in England. With the care of American Methodism on his heart, and with a view not to personal aggrandizement but to the glory of God and the salvation of souls, John Wesley fell back upon primitive Christian procedure and with other episcopally ordained presbyters, acting as an *episcopate in commission*, in due form consecrated Dr. Thomas Coke superintendent or bishop for American Methodism. The validity of Methodist orders may well be acknowledged by the Anglican Communion and the Protestant Episcopal Church in particular, on the basis of the historic action and attitude of the Church of England in recognizing the validity of the presbyterial orders of the Reformed Continental Churches, on the basis of necessity, and on the assertion of Archbishop Ussher that, "Where bishops can not be had the ordination of presbyters standeth valid."

This statement made by John Wesley should be known by all clergy and communicants of the Protestant Episcopal Church:

To all to whom these presents shall come, John Wesley, late Fellow of Lincoln College, in Oxford, Presbyter of the Church of England, sendeth greeting. Whereas, many of the people in the southern province of North America, who desire to continue under my care and still adhere to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, are greatly distressed for want of ministers to administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the same Church; and whereas there does not appear to be any other way of supplying them with ministers, —Know all men that I, John Wesley, think myself to be providentially called at this

¹⁹ *Tract XV*, Vol. I. J. G. and F. Rivington and J. H. Parker, Oxford, 1839, p. 11.

time to set apart some persons for the work of the ministry in America. And therefore, under the protection of Almighty God, and with a single eye to his glory, I have this day set apart as a superintendent, by the imposition of hands, and prayer (being assisted by other ordained ministers) Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, a presbyter of the Church of England, and a man whom I judge to be well qualified for that great work. And I do hereby recommend him to all to whom it may concern, as a fit person to preside over the flock of Christ. In testimony whereof I have set my hand and seal, this second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty four.

John Wesley.

Backed by scholarship, the historic attitude of the Church of England, and the manifest fruitfulness of their respective ministries, the Anglican Communion, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in particular, might well acknowledge the church status and ministerial validity of the Reformed Churches and the Methodist Church. They are reformed catholic churches, protestant for the orthodox faith, possessing ministries acknowledged as valid by our own reforming Fathers. Over against a partially reformed Romanism still claiming the right to exercise ecclesiastical absolutism, and proclaiming as true doctrines that are unbiblical, nonpatristic, and non-catholic, the world needs to see arise a reconstituted catholicism fashioned of orthodox churches, reformed biblical, and conciliar catholic, protestant *against* absolutism and error and protestant *for* biblical, patristic, and conciliar truth. The Protestant Episcopal Church should make an unreserved acknowledgment of the validity of Methodist Orders within the *Sacerdotium* of the Holy Catholic Church and of the Methodist Church as a true and reformed Catholic and Protestant church. It should seek union with her and the two made one should lead reformed, divided Christendom into the reconstitution of a true Catholicism which, under Christ, could accomplish the redemption of the nations. "Disunity," said Bishop Brent, "is the cult of the incomplete." May it be the honor of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Methodist Church to lead in the removal of that incompleteness from the contemporary Christian scene.

A "Right Strawy Epistle"

F. J. YETTER

THERE IS A BOOK of the New Testament which Protestantism has grossly undervalued—the Epistle of James. The Protestant underestimation of this book probably has followed the view of Martin Luther, who thought that James's Epistle didn't amount to much. He called it a "right strawy epistle." Luther took this view because he believed that James's teaching on the subject of "works" contradicted Paul's doctrine of "justification by faith." Luther believed that Paul's epistle to the Romans, in which his characteristic doctrine is expressed, was the key to a proper understanding of the New Testament. The house of faith that Paul was constructing was, in Luther's view, a house of brick or stone. The house James would have built, he thought a house of straw.

Paul's Epistles have had, without the slightest question, an immense influence in the development of Christianity. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith has been, and is, fundamental in the theology of Protestantism. It ought also, however, to be said that Christianity would have gained immeasurably, perhaps would have been prevented from writing some of the dark chapters of its history, if the Epistle of James had had the recognition which it deserved. Protestantism many times in its history would have been far less forbidding, would have had more mellowness and attractiveness, more "sweetness and light," if the devotees of Reform had paid just a bit less attention to Paul and a bit more to James.

It ought first of all to be observed in this matter of the seeming contradiction between Paul and James that each, when he uses the word "works," has a considerably different idea in mind. Paul, when he used the word, generally had in mind Jewish ceremonial works, comparable, let us say, to the Roman Catholic's abstention from meat on Friday or to the Roman Catholic practice of wearing medals and scapulars. James on the other hand tended to think of "works" in terms of humanitarian effort—what we would call welfare work. Roman Catholicism preserves this distinction by giving to these latter the name of "corporal works of mercy."

F. J. YETTER, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., is Pastor of Grace Methodist Church, Paterson, New Jersey. He makes an appeal for revaluation of one of the New Testament books which, despite appearances, is not nearly "last" either in date or in importance.

We must not think of either Paul or James as setting out consciously to make this distinction. The interpretation which each placed upon "works" was based upon his own religious experience and upon the environment in which he moved. Salvation was achieved, according to Paul, by a spiritual convulsion which transformed one's whole nature. Moreover, Paul moved in the realm of the universal. Salvation, to be genuine, must be within the reach of all, Jew and Gentile alike. The "works" enjoined by the Jewish Law were impossible for the Gentile, nearly so for the Jew. The simple life of faith was within the reach of all. The uplifted moral life, created by the transforming power of the Spirit, came in practice then to be set over against the ceremonial works of the law. The real antithesis for Paul, it must be added, was not between ceremonial and moral "works"; nor indeed was it even, as is commonly supposed, between faith and works. Rather the antithesis was, as Sanday points out, between a salvation earned by some merit of the human soul and a salvation bestowed by the free gift of God.

For James the transition from Judaism to Christianity was more gradual than for Paul. It was the ethics of Christianity rather than its theology and soteriology which attracted him. Though he had his moments of ardent faith and deep feeling, James was not so much the poet and prophet as he was the leader and practical administrator. For him practical conduct had to be a primary consideration. One might say that while Paul thought of the influence of Jesus as resulting in the transformation of the human personality James thought of it as resulting in the transformation of the law. From being a law of ceremony and ritual, it became a law of equity and mutual helpfulness.

This distinction between ceremonial and humanitarian works, important as it is, must not be pushed too far in a consideration of the Protestant viewpoint. Protestantism, to be sure, recognizes the distinction clearly and enforces it emphatically, but that distinction does not have any direct bearing on Protestantism's central conviction. Protestantism believes in salvation by *faith*. It maintains that salvation is achieved no more by humanitarian works than by ceremonial works. One is not saved because he does the works. He does the works, ceremonial or humanitarian, because he is saved.

In the second place, it ought to be observed that Paul and James both are convinced of the necessity of faith, and that both are also convinced of the necessity of works. Their difference is not even so much a matter of emphasis as it is a matter of priority. As D. A. Hayes said it, "Paul is

looking at the root; James is looking at the fruit."¹ Paul's condemnation of "works" rested upon the fact, as he saw it, that they were "dead." They had no life, and hence no power to give life. But he might have said, and still been consistent with his central purpose, that it was the faith that was dead. Men went through the routine of religion from a sense of authoritarian compulsion. They performed dead works—that is to say they performed works in a dead and dull and uninspired and uninspiring way because vital faith was gone. Living faith had become dead dogma.

It is a curious commentary on the views of Paul and James that both used the life of Abraham to illustrate their teaching. Paul said Abraham had reason to be proud of his works; "but not before God," he adds (Rom. 4:2). His salvation came by faith. James, in thinking about the life of Abraham, seized upon the incident of the intended sacrifice of Isaac. Paul was impressed with Abraham's *faith*. James was impressed with the fact that he did something about it. He was "justified by works" (James 2:21). That, James realizes, is not an entirely accurate statement of the case, and he adds, "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works and by works was faith made perfect?" (James 2:22). A paraphrase might be, "Do you not see how faith was completed and perfected because it was accompanied by works?"

Paul's central conviction is salvation by faith. The essence of his theology, and of the theology of Protestantism, is the transforming power of the Spirit of Christ. The evangelical movement called it "conversion." The idea is a splendid one. This transformation of the human spirit by the power of God in Christ must be at the heart of any vital Christian faith. But the difficulty is that there are conversions and conversions. There is a conversion which really transforms a rotter into a respectable citizen, and a merely respectable citizen into a hero and a saint. In Paul's words, it makes him a "new creation" in Christ Jesus. Then there is a superficial kind of conversion, a conversion which gives a man a veneer of religion, and, what is worse, gives him along with his sham religion a vanity which makes him suppose that he *is* a new man. In actuality he has merely put on a new suit of clothes. To use Wesley's phrase, copying the phrase of Paul (2 Tim. 3:5), he has put on the "form of godliness" without having its "power."

We have to remember that saying "I believe" does not make a man a Christian, any more than putting on a new suit of clothes transforms his personality. To express it more accurately, even feeling deeply, or seeming

¹ Hayes, D. A., *The New Testament Epistles*. Abingdon Press, 1921, p. 112.

to feel deeply, about Christ, does not make a man a Christian any more than feeling deeply, or seeming to feel deeply, about a woman makes a man a perfect lover or a perfect husband. We still have to apply the test that James applied—and that Jesus applied: what kind of person was he afterward? How did he treat his mother, or his wife, or his brothers and sisters, or his friends—or his enemies?

James's chief test of a man's loyalty to Jesus is not a bad sort of test. In modern times we give it a high-sounding Greek name—we call it "pragmatism." This is his test: "Did he bridle his tongue? Did he learn to say kind, helpful, gracious things instead of malicious, hateful, hurtful things?"

James uses the figure of the bit which is put into the horse's mouth to guide and control him. Our tongues, he says, are too often like wild horses, without bit or bridle. They are permitted to roam where they please, say what they please. They trample upon the feelings of all they meet. James's observation is verified in human experience. All of us have come upon vast regions of hell in homes, in churches, and in other areas of life created by men or women or both, who insisted on "having their say."

Again James uses the figure of a great fire. We think of a forest fire. The tiny spark seems insignificant, but it kindles the dry grass, and presently acres and acres of timber are a roaring inferno. So, says James, the tactless, unkind word stirs up strife between two people. Others take sides. The quarrel spreads. Presently the whole community has become a babel of wrangling voices. "Behold," James observes, "how great a matter a little fire kindleth" (3:5). You can't do that and be a Christian, he continues. "If any man among you *seem* to be religious and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain" (1:26).

The tongue is only the chief instance of many unrestrained impulses. Just as the tongue unrestrained brings division and strife, so all desires unrestrained bring envy, hatred, strife, war, and all manner of evil. You want certain things and are determined to get them; but others want certain things which contradict your wants, and they are just as determined as you. To translate James's thought into the language of modern life, we might say it this way. You drive recklessly on the highway. You want to get somewhere in a hurry. Someone else just as reckless wants to do the same thing—result, tragedy. Or you want the money, the job, or the high wages that others want. All try without restraint to get the same things. The result is social strife, class hatred, civil war. Or a nation wants land,

coal, oil that other nations want. All are determined to have them at any cost. The result is war. "Ye lust and have not," says James, "so ye murder. Ye desire to have and cannot obtain; so ye fight and war" (4:2).

Just as it is in our relations with other people, so it is in our concern with ourselves. Unrestrained desire leads to mental strife—worry, anxiety, fear. You want, for instance, a home. On the other hand you want an automobile. You cannot afford both. But you do not restrain your desire for either. You *will* have both on the instant. One unrestrained desire wars against the other. The result is mental turmoil, worry, anxiety, fear—and actual poverty.

The trouble, James says, is that we are thinking of what we *want*, instead of what we *are* and ought to be. We are like "a man beholding his natural face in a glass; for he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was" (1:23-24). There were, of course, no photographs in James's day. Mirrors were rare and costly. It was not often that a man saw his own face. He could easily forget what his face looked like. We are like that, he says. If we ever analyze our own situation, take stock, see what our actualities and our possibilities—and our limitations—are, the memory soon fades. We go our way. We forget the real thing we *are*, and go on pursuing the thing we *want*.

Even more important than knowing what we *are*, James says, is knowing what we *ought* to be. It is not enough to look into a mirror on a dressing table and see your own face; you must look into the mirror of the spiritual life and see the face of Christ. It is not enough to look into our hearts and see ourselves as we are. We must look into the "perfect law of liberty," expressed in the Sermon on the Mount, and see ourselves as we *ought* to be.

With that picture fixed firmly in mind, the picture of what we ought to be as seen in the life and teaching of the Master, we must do something about it. We must make a copy of it in our own life, "being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work." This man, says James, "shall be blessed in his deed" (1:25). His mind will not be a maelstrom of quarreling and strife and mental anguish. His mind will be at peace. He will do the right and the true, and will be happy and blessed in the doing.

James anticipated modern interpretations of Christianity not only in his pragmatism, but in his emphasis upon quiet service to his fellow human beings as essential in the Christian ideal. If you are anything like what you ought to be, James says, if you have truly accepted Christ, if you are a doer and not just a hearer, your life will not be revolving around *yourself* and *your* wants, but it will be spreading sunshine and cheer and helpfulness

into the lives of other people, especially the less fortunate members of society—the widows and orphans, the sick and the poor. "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith?" (2:5).

If we were tracing ideas to their source, we should probably find that the warm humanitarian feeling which was poured into America by the movements for human betterment of the nineteenth century was derived in good measure from the teaching of James. James was a pragmatist in this as in all matters. He could not stand aside and simply feel compassion for people. He believed, like the Master, that ministering to their need was a function of the church. How can you talk religion to people, James asks his brethren, when their stomachs are empty or when their ragged clothing robs them not only of warmth but of their own self-respect? "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit?" (2:15-16).

James was thoroughly modern in his idea of philanthropy. The great need, as he saw it, was, to use the modern phrase, "not charity, but a chance." There are moments when James rises to the height of Amos in his demand for social justice. He burns with anger at the thought that "the hire of the laborers" has been "kept back by fraud" (5:4) while the idle rich "have lived in pleasure on the earth" (5:5). "Go to now, ye rich men," he exclaims, "weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire" (5:1-3).

Social justice, James with Amos—and with Jesus—believes, must have a religious basis. It must rest upon a right relationship of man with man. However men may differ in intelligence or in worldly wealth or prestige, there is a kind of equality that all possess before God. That equality, above all, must be preserved in the church. James denounces the church ushers who show one man to a seat of honor in the church because his "gold ring" and his "gay clothing" mark him as belonging to the higher class, while the poor man in vile raiment is shown to an inconspicuous and undesirable place (2:2-3). You cannot show such discrimination, says James, and be Christian. "If ye have respect to persons," he says, "ye commit sin" (2:9).

In justice to Judaism it ought to be said that a good deal of this emphasis on equality and charity and social justice was a Jewish heritage. Those who

are interested in finding some working relationship between Judaism and Christianity would do well to give considerable attention to this epistle. It unquestionably has a strongly Jewish tinge. The very name of the author, Jacob, the Hebrew name translated "James," preserved partly in the Italian Giacomo and the French Jacques, reminds us that the author was named after one of the great ancestors of the Jewish race. The book is thought by some scholars to be the first book of the New Testament committed to writing (between A.D. 40 and 50) and, if that is true, pictures a period when the church had not yet declared its independence entirely from Jewish forms. Christians still went to the synagogue to worship. They were simply Jews who had come to believe in Jesus as the Messiah and had become followers of the Way. The author addresses himself to "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad" (1:1). The word "gospel," so conspicuous in Paul's letters, does not occur. The epistle makes no mention of the incarnation or of the resurrection. There are only two references, and these only casual, to the Messiah. One of them is in the first sentence of the epistle where the author calls himself "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." These omissions seem especially significant if, as is commonly supposed, the author was "James, the Lord's brother," referred to in Gal. 1:19.

Having given due weight to its Jewish coloring, we must go on to insist upon the unmistakably Christian character of the book. It has a close affinity with the Gospels, even though the word "gospel" is not mentioned in it; indeed a closer affinity with the Gospel utterances than has the teaching of Paul. Like the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is a kind of link of Old Testament with New. Hebrews sees the Old Testament priestly sacrificial system as culminating in the one sacrifice of Jesus on the cross. In the case of James it is the Law and the Wisdom literature that find their culmination in the teaching of Jesus. The Law of the Old Testament finds its culmination and completion in "the royal law," namely that "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (2:8). The law of Moses has been supplanted by the teaching of Jesus, which is the "perfect law of liberty" (1:25). The Wisdom literature of the Old Testament period has filled James with the desire to be "a wise man and endued with knowledge" (3:13). In the teaching of Jesus he has found "the wisdom that is from above" (3:17). The truly wise man, he has discovered, is the man who can "shew out of a good conversation his works with meekness" (3:13).

Whether or not James's theology takes cognizance of the problem of Jesus' relationship to God, the spirit of Jesus and of his concern to do the

heavenly Father's will breathes through all the epistle. James's denunciation of the idle rich previously mentioned is reminiscent not only of the diatribes of Amos against the wealthy and oppressive merchant princes but also of Jesus' condemnation of the scribes who load the people with burdens too heavy to be borne, while they themselves touch not the burdens with one of their fingers (Luke 11:46). His concern for a practical ministry to the poor to replace the too-often hypocritical worship of the sanctuary is of a piece with Jesus' horror of the hypocritical worship on the part of those who "devour widows' houses and for a pretense make long prayer" (Matt. 23:14). James has learned from Jesus that in the spiritual life as in the world of nature men cannot "gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles" (Matt. 7:16). The figure is slightly different in James, but he seems to have heard Jesus' words; for like Jesus he puts the sentence in the form of a question, "Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs?" (3:12). James's words, "Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up" (4:10) are an echo of Jesus' "Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Luke 14:11). James's admonition to be doers and not merely hearers is the same as Jesus' final bit of advice in the Sermon on the Mount. Hearing and not doing, both James and Jesus say, is pointless. It can have no permanent value in the spiritual life. James says it is like glancing for a moment into a mirror and forgetting immediately what one has seen. Jesus says it is like building one's house on a shifting and insecure foundation. In the storm and stress of life, the spiritual values we thought we treasured are swept away.

Above all, James stands for that inner spirit which is the distinguishing mark of the gospel of Jesus. In a sense more directly than Paul he points to that wholeness, that spiritual integrity, that purity of mind and heart which must be in every age the first and most essential quality of the Christian life. "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners," he admonishes, "and purify your hearts, ye double-minded" (4:8). Even less than Paul is James an ascetic, calling upon the Christian to live a life secluded from the world. The Christian is to be *in* the world, yet not *of* the world. He is to move among his fellows, but he is to keep himself "unspotted" from the vileness and cheapness and vice and evil in the world about him. He is to make himself each day more worthy to be called a child of God, more worthy to "receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him" (1:12).

It is a strange fact about the Bible that, though it is the great textbook

of religion, the word "religion" occurs in the English translation only five times. It is fitting that one of those occurrences should be in the Epistle of James (1:27), for it is, not so much by what it says as by what it implies, one of the finest and most practical and most "modern" definitions of religion ever written. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

That definition does not displace other great definitions of the faith. Protestantism's central conviction must ever rest upon Paul's teaching of "justification by faith." The definition of James is a pragmatic definition, and no more than the pragmatism of the modern James, can the teaching of this epistle be accepted as a total view of life. It does not serve to define a philosophy of religion, but rather to test the validity of the Christian experience, a fact which James himself would have been the first to recognize. Did he not say to one who opposed his view, "Shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works"? (2:18) We might paraphrase it somewhat in the language of our own day: "You cannot show me your faith—you have none. You are without works, the essential test of faith. I will show you *my* faith—I have the works to prove it."

The Nature of Sanctity

A Comparison of Two Nineteenth-Century Saints

ERNEST WALL

SOME YEARS AGO, Father Martindale of England gave a series of radio lectures under the title, "What are Saints?" His examples were drawn from the first to the twentieth century, and were, of course, all Roman Catholics. His definition of a saint, however, was one equally acceptable to Evangelicals. A saint, he said, was a person; a person who had altered human life, and had done this because he had an intense belief in God, an intense love for Christ, and an intense devotion to mankind. That definition is akin to and agrees with the assertion of Father Tyrrell that a saint differs from an ordinary Christian in degree; or, as Father Martindale would say, in *intensity*.

The fact that saints are persons is a wholesome point to make. It means that of necessity there are many kinds of saints. Their personalities, their professions, their practices differed; because their sanctity was an expression of their individual apprehension of the idea of the Holy. Teresa of Avila has been likened to an eagle; but who would say that of Francis of Assisi? Thomas Aquinas has been called the Angelic Doctor; but in what a difference sense such a title would have to be used of the Curé of Ars! Francis Xavier may rightly be called the Courier of Christ; but Brother Lawrence trod unshod the narrow confines of a monastery kitchen. Yet, whatever the differences between the saints of God, they all experienced Pascal's definition of sanctity: "*Dieu sensible au coeur.*"

To understand, therefore, the nature of sanctity, we must resort to simplification, and find some fundamental classification of the mind of the saint. It is not enough to say with Dom Louismet, in *The Mystical Life*, that sanctity is "presence of God"; or that it is to have nothing at all in order to find that we have all in God. It is not enough even to say that sainthood is the life of "the loving soul with God," or to use strong adjectives to describe the saints. All of them were intense. All earned the adjective "tremendous": they had tremendous faith in God, and tremendous influence upon man. The secret of sanctity does lie in the heart of the

ERNEST WALL, Ph.D., is pastor of Trinity Church, Richmond Hill (Queens), New York City. The writer's thesis is that the *nature* of sanctity is one; but its *expression* may vary—as this article begins to set forth.

saint. It does involve the relinquishment of all that would hinder the inflow and control of the life of God in the soul. The holy life is a life of "fusion"; but there are differences of form in which the experience reveals itself, so that it has been called variously a spiritual pilgrimage, or passion, or ambition.

Evelyn Underhill has shown us the way to the most helpful simplification. In her work on *Mysticism*¹ she suggests that sanctity is the spiritual answer to the three deepest cravings of the self: the urge which makes man a pilgrim, seeking some Eldorado or better country, the urge which makes him a lover, and the urge for perfection. These three cravings, she believes, answer to the different temperaments of the mystics, and the several ways they achieve that state of spiritual consciousness which may be described as union with the divine—an experience expressed in such words as those of Paul: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me": and one which fulfills that profound word of Athanasius: "Christ became man that we might become God."²

This classification, however, may still further be simplified. Sanctity as the end of a pilgrimage, the goal of a quest, is a usual and a very general idea. Bunyan used it thus in *Pilgrim's Progress*; so did Dante in his *Divine Comedy*; but it is not exactly distinctive. A consuming love which leads only to a sterile quietism is rightly frowned upon. Sanctity is a quest, and it must be marked by progress; but its nature is best discerned by considering the other two urges named by Miss Underhill; they are the quest for the Love of God, and the quest for the Life of God. Both these quests demand tremendous passion and patience; but one of these two characteristics predominates in every saint. The urge of the lover is the passion for completion; its aim is spiritual union—the marriage of the soul with God. The urge to perfection is the passion to transcend oneself—the quest to be the obedient servant or slave of God. It is to find oneself in him.

I

From the story of the nineteenth century we may select two women generally deemed worthy of the title "saint," who illustrate the nature of sanctity as revealed in these two fundamental ways: Frances Ridley Havergal, a Protestant who was born in England on December 14, 1836, and lived forty-two years; Soeur Thérèse of Lisieux, a Catholic who was born in France January 2, 1873, and lived twenty-four years.

¹ New edition, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1948. See pp. 126-129.

² *De Incarnatione Verbi*, 1:108.

Marie Françoise Thérèse Martin was born in the Norman village of Alençon, to form the wish that became the supreme desire of her life: to love God as he had never been loved before. Her parents were devout Catholics and had the distinction of having nine children. Four of these died in infancy. Of the five girls who lived, four entered the Lisieux institution of Carmel. The fifth was, for a time, a visiting nun at Caen.³

Thérèse, the youngest of these nine children, was not yet five years old when her mother died. The family then moved to Lisieux to be near relatives who could assist in the upbringing of the motherless girls. Here Thérèse passed most of her life. Soon after arriving, she one day visited with her father the chapel of the Carmel institution which she was later to make famous.

When she was five and a half years of age Thérèse heard a sermon on the Passion of Christ, which was the first sermon she recalls ever understanding. It moved her profoundly. Quite early she aspired to be a nun; her formal education was taken at the Benedictine Convent in Lisieux; when she was nine she revealed this desire for the cloister to her eldest sister Marie (who became "Marie of the Sacred Heart") but it was not until her fifteenth year that her father consented to her entering Carmel as soon as she could receive permission.

It was in the hope of hastening this permission that she, her sister Céline, and her father joined the annual pilgrimage to Rome. She requested the Pope's permission to enter Carmel on her fifteenth birthday; but she actually entered three months after her fifteenth anniversary. She did not take the veil until the September of her eighteenth year.

During the next two years she read greatly in the writings of Saint John of the Cross and *The Imitation of Christ*; but in her twentieth year she began her simple but arresting study of the Scriptures, and confessed: "It is the Gospel above all that occupies me in my prayer. . . . I am forever discovering in it hidden mysterious meanings."

In her twenty-second year her father died; her sister Céline entered Carmel; and her sister Pauline (now Mother Agnes of Jesus and Prioress of the Lisieux Carmel) ordered her, as a discipline, to write her memories. Thus began the first of the three manuscripts she wrote which after her death were combined and published as *L'Histoire d'une Âme*. All her life she wrote wonderful letters (now collected) and composed many devotional poems; but it was her autobiography, published after her death, which

³ In the *Collected Letters of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux* No 231, she explains to the Abbé Bellière that this sister (Léonie) tried her vocation in a Visitation Convent, and later returned to the world, where she lived "as in the cloister." Léonie died in 1941.

lifted her from obscurity to world renown. That simple but sincere work electrified and charmed all who read it. Her example enlisted followers, elicited prayers, and inspired such faith, in all parts of the world, that in 1925 she was deemed worthy to be canonized by her Church.

II

Frances Ridley Havergal (familiarily known as F.R.H.) was born at Astley, Worcestershire. She was the youngest of six children—none of whom died in infancy. Her father, a minister of the Church of England, was an accomplished musician. His musical setting of "From Greenland's Icy Mountains" reaped one hundred and eighty pounds (about \$900). For his "Cathedral Service in A" he received a gold medal prize, and another for his anthem, "Give Thanks." Thus F.R.H. grew up in an atmosphere of music, culture, and religion. She joined in the regular Sunday school services, and the evening hymn-singing at home. She heard her father composing, as he did, hundreds of chants, tunes, and sacred songs; and when she was seven years of age, she herself began composing rhymes and hymns, as well as stories which revealed her innate literary bent.

When she was six years of age, she, like Thérèse Martin, heard a sermon which was instrumental in her spiritual direction. It was on God's Judgment; and while it caused her inward distress, it led her into that serious religious thought and consecrated living which marked the whole of her life. When she was eleven, her mother died. This early sadness deepened her sense of spiritual need. She expressed it in the words: "Oh to believe in Jesus; to believe that he had forgiven me. That was my cry."⁴ It was some months later, in February, 1851, that her teacher, Miss Cooke (who later became her stepmother), led her into the full assurance of faith in Christ.

In her sixteenth year, F.R.H. accompanied her father and Miss Cooke (now Mrs. Havergal) to Germany, and entered school at Düsseldorf. This was her "finishing school" and the end of her formal education; but she kept up her studies in German, French, English, studied Hebrew under a tutor, and Greek under her father. She wrote poems in German, French, and English, and broadened her outlook by visiting other lands—Switzerland for the Alpine climbing which she loved, Ireland, France, Germany. She was also a fine musician, an excellent singer, and a wonderful teacher.

With the end of her school days at Düsseldorf, she returned to England to prepare for her Confirmation. It took place in Worcester Cathedral;

⁴ See *Memorials of Frances Ridley Havergal*, by her sister. Page 29.

and among the papers found after her death was a verse she apparently wrote at the time. It bore the title: "Thine for ever," and read:

Oh! "Thine for ever," what a blessed thing
To be for ever His who died for me.
My Saviour, all my life Thy praise I'll sing
Nor cease my song throughout eternity.

In 1860 her father went to the county parish of Shareshill; and the next year F.R.H. became tutor to her older sister's two children. Characteristically, she took the opportunity to study Latin and Italian in her spare moments. She further developed her singing talent, and became soprano soloist for the Philharmonic Society of Kidderminster.

Soon, however, weakness and "debility" began to affect her, so that she confined herself to tutoring and religious work; when her nieces went to school (1866) F.R.H. returned home; and, thereafter she resided there. A year later the family removed to Leamington for their father's health; but he died in 1870. Now her literary output greatly increased. She prepared for publication her father's *Psalmody*, wrote several hymns and tunes for a new hymnal, *Songs of Grace and Glory*, composed verses for gift and New Year cards as well as other poems, wrote articles for religious journals, religious books for children, and other devotional books; she also engaged in a multitude of speaking engagements, which kept her busy but taxed her strength.

In 1874, F.R.H. contracted typhoid fever. She was ill for several months; and when at length she attempted a short vacation, she suffered a relapse. Her recovery was slow; but it was then she wrote, "I am quite satisfied to do half-day's work henceforth, if He pleases. . . . He can make a *half-hour's* work worth a whole day's, if He will." That statement might be placed beside one by Soeur Thérèse. In a letter to her sister Céline she wrote: "It seems to me that God does not need years to do His work of love in a soul; a ray from His heart can, in an instant, bring His flower to blossoming for eternity." These are characteristic utterances.

Like all true Christians—including Soeur Thérèse—F.R.H. learned much from her illnesses and trials. They deepened her knowledge of God, and so made fuller her consecration to him. "When a trial is past," she wrote, "one does so bitterly regret not having trusted Him entirely in it; and one sees that we might as well have had all the joy and rest of perfect trust all along." This trust she deepened by prolonged prayer and meditation.⁵ Many of the resulting insights of these quiet hours she

⁵ See *Memorials*, p. 280: a weekly list of subjects for prayer and meditation.

passed on to her friends in letters,⁶ and addresses,⁷ as well as in articles, poems, and books. In 1878 her stepmother died; and one year later her own busy life on earth ceased.

III

There is a sense in which it may be said that no two persons less resembled each other; and yet, they had so many things in common. Both were the youngest of their family. Both had very religious families. Both were themselves intensely religious from childhood. Both were named after a saint. The namesake of Soeur Thérèse was the famed Teresa of Avila; and F.R.H. bore the name of the famous martyr, Bishop Ridley. In her *Ministry of Song* she wrote of this:

But "What the R doth represent"
I value and revere.
A diamond clasp it seems to be
On golden chains enlinking me
In loyal love to England's hope
The Church I hold so dear.

The father of F.R.H. was an Anglican Rector; and her parents' prayers and example in Christian grace and practice early made religion the keynote of her life. The parents of Soeur Thérèse were devout Catholics. Her father had tried to enter the Cistercian Order of Monks in Switzerland; and her mother had hoped to belong to the Order of Saint Vincent de Paul. Both had been refused; but this thwarted desire must have strongly influenced the lives of their children.

Both F.R.H. and Soeur Thérèse were deeply influenced during childhood by the death of their mothers. Mrs. Havergal died when Frances was eleven. She had sung to her mother a favorite verse, and seen her receive the Communion for the Sick. Later she had watched the funeral cortege leave the house; and had rushed away from the window to her room. There she had flung herself upon the bed and cried as the lonesome realization swept over her that she was motherless. Mme. Martin died when Thérèse was but five; and her blithe and carefree nature changed completely after the event. Mostly she was kept away from her dying mother; but, like F.R.H., she saw her mother receive the last rites of the Church, and kissed her mother's death-cold brow. From that time she became timid, nervous, oversensitive, and was subject to violent tremblings and fears.

⁶ Many of these are preserved in *Memorials*.

⁷ Some notes of these are in *Starlight Through the Shadows*, her last, unfinished book.

This psychological disturbance led to a strange seizure, in which she gazed fixedly at a statue of the Virgin. When the seizure was passed, she was healed. Soeur Thérèse wrote her own version of what transpired. Her sister, Pauline, had taken the veil at Carmel. This loss of her favorite sister came, says Miss Sackville-West, as a "bewildering blow." She became subject to strange illusions; and this day had called out for her oldest sister, Marie, but failed to recognize her. She then fixed her eyes in strange fashion upon a statue of the Virgin Mary that was in the room. "Finding no help on earth I turned toward my Mother in Heaven, praying with all my heart that she might take pity on me. Suddenly the statue came to life. The Virgin Mary became beautiful . . . advanced toward me . . . smiled."⁸ Thérèse was persuaded to relate this experience to the nuns at Carmel; but, she writes sadly, "There are intimate thoughts which cannot be translated into the language of earth without instantly losing their profound and heavenly meaning."

An obvious likeness between these two saints is that they were both loyal and zealous in their own religion. On her Confirmation Day, F.R.H. wrote that Satan had been busy with her all day, and she was grieved at her coldness of heart. Yet as she records the experiences of that day, it is clear that a mild state of rapture caused her heart to beat fast; and each anniversary of the occasion she renewed her confirmation vow, spent the day in holy retirement, and wrote poetic lines expressing her fervent consecration to God. For example, two years later she writes:

A COVENANT

Now Lord I give myself to Thee,
I would be wholly Thine;
As Thou hast given Thyself for me,
And Thou art wholly mine.
Oh take me, seal me as Thine own,
Thine altogether—Thine alone."⁹

Soeur Thérèse speaks of her First Communion as a moment of spiritual "fusion," or union with Christ: "We were no longer two." Unlike F.R.H. who approached the hour with a feeling of unworthiness, Soeur Thérèse regarded it as a desired moment of utter abandonment to Christ. "I shall always remember my First Communion Day as one of unclouded happiness." Both of them were clearly prepared in spirit for the momentous event; and F.R.H. could have joined Soeur Thérèse in saying, "I am not

⁸ Note Miss Sackville-West's account and comments on this incident: *The Eagle and the Dove*, Doubleday and Company, 1944, p. 106.

⁹ *Memorials*, p. 56.

trusting in my own merits, for I have none; but I trust in Him who is Virtue and Holiness itself.¹⁰ Thus for them both an early sermon, the death of their mothers, and this experience of Communion were the most significant events in their early spiritual history.

Early experiences of devotion led both of them into an impatience with worldly pleasures, because they were a waste of time. From her cloister Soeur Thérèse wrote her sister Céline: "During the brief moments that remain to us, let us not waste our time. Let us save souls."¹¹—a sentiment that was voiced many times by F.R.H.¹² Both rejoiced in Christ's personal presence with them, and felt that anything which dimmed the consciousness of this was not to be tolerated in their own lives, nor condoned in the lives of others. On one occasion F.R.H. was asked to sing in *Elijah* the part of Jezebel; but she came to realize that it was an impossible inconsistency for a Christian girl to impersonate Jezebel; so she declined the part! Soeur Thérèse went much further than this. Anything which she *liked*, she considered dangerous and to be renounced. It was this ascetic attitude of mind which prepared her for a nun's life of total renunciation of the pleasures of the senses. Her philosophy was that "in this world there is no fruitfulness without suffering—either personal pain, anguish of soul, or trials known sometimes only to God."

This "intolerance" was not only evident in their attitude to worldliness and pleasure. F.R.H. was as strongly and strictly a Protestant as Soeur Thérèse was a Catholic; and while both were united in giving themselves fully and unreservedly to Christ, neither saw values in the other religion. In the case of a Catholic, this inability to see the value of any other expression of faith might be expected. Not all Evangelicals, however, would express themselves against Roman Catholicism as strongly as did F.R.H. While she was in Germany she wrote a friend, at great length, of a visit to the Roman Catholic Cathedral of Münster. It distressed her greatly. To her eyes everything about the service had the most "heathenish look": and she particularly disapproved of a litany to the *saints*, which called for the repeated chant *to them*, "*Ora pro nobis*."¹³

IV

Whatever the difference in their religious outlooks and expression, both these saints lived strenuous religious lives. From childhood F.R.H.

¹⁰ Ch. 4 of *A Little White Flower* (English translation of her *Histoire d'une Âme*).

¹¹ *Letters*, p. 112. Written in her 17th year.

¹² See Ch. 2 of *Kept for the Master's Use*.

¹³ *Memorials*, p. 45.

had prayed to be prepared for what God was preparing her for; and the childhood prayer of Soeur Thérèse was, more simply, "May it please God to make me good." Both of them wanted to be missionaries. Both of them were hindered by ill health from achieving this desire. "All my life," wrote F.R.H., "it has been a 'castle in the air' to be a missionary." Her favorite field was the Zenana work of India; and she supported it by prayer and gifts (on one occasion giving the proceeds of the sale of all her jewelry) all her life. Soeur Thérèse wistfully desired to be transferred to a convent in Indo-China. She never went, but she corresponded with two missionary priests, became their sister and partner in God, and helped their work—with a keen sense of responsibility—by prayer and intercession.

They were both great believers in prayer. "The power of prayer is indeed wonderful," said Soeur Thérèse in her autobiography. "It is like a queen who, having free access always to the King, can obtain whatever she asks. . . . For me, prayer is an uplifting of the heart, a glance toward heaven, a cry of gratitude and love." F.R.H. attests the value of prayer by saying, "Prayer is answered . . . the very pressure of spirit to pray becomes the pledge and earnest of the answer, for it is the working of his will in us"; and at the end of a chapter on "Effectual Prayer"¹⁴ she quotes approvingly the words of John Newton:

Thou art coming to a King,
Large petitions with thee bring
For His grace and power are such
None can ever ask too much.

Moreover, both gained strength and inspiration from the Bible. To F.R.H. the Bible was her most precious possession. It was to understand it better that she learned Greek and Hebrew. Her letters are studded with texts. So are her books. She said she quoted so much Scripture because God's promise of effect and success was for *his* Word, not hers! Soeur Thérèse was a Catholic. She used other aids to devotion until, as she expressed it, she discovered "the treasures hidden in the Holy Gospels." Hence it has been said that the Bible more than the saints moulded her life and thought. To read her autobiography is to have new and revealing insights into the practical significance of the teaching of Jesus—especially the more difficult parts of the Sermon on the Mount.¹⁵ Both saints had a simple and delightful insight into the personal appeal and devotional significance of the Holy Scriptures.

¹⁴ *Royal Commandments; or Morning Thoughts for the King's Servants.*

¹⁵ See *A Little White Flower*, Ch. 10.

Both answered, each in her own way, the inspiration of the Bible to loving service. The austere and comfortless Carmelite life—rising at five A.M., living as much as possible in silence, in an unheated cell, without washstand or chair or bed other than a board across two trestles—was made by Soeur Thérèse an offering to God. Yet she developed richness and depth in her simple philosophy of charity to others: "We must be vigilant in little things," she said; "The Lord expects works from us. If you see a sick sister whom you can relieve, never fear losing your devotion; compassionate her; if she is in pain, feel for it as if it were your own. . . . This is the true union of our will with the will of God." "I ought to seek the companionship of those sisters for whom I have a natural aversion, and try to be their Good Samaritan."¹⁰

A similar spirit of self-abnegation and disregard for comfort characterized F.R.H. The urge to do something for Jesus disrupted even the necessary vacations from her strenuous life of service. She went to Newport for a rest; but by the end of the week she was working at the Infirmary. "In the women's ward I read and prayed and sang, and then spoke to each alone. I saw there was both sowing and reaping wanted." To gauge her diligence in the business of the Lord, one has only to read the list of things she set herself to accomplish the last year of her life. It included singing lessons, musical compositions, the writing of poems, articles, Bible lessons, children's books, and devotional books; and this in addition to her work with the church, the Y.W.C.A. and her various endeavors for missions abroad, missions to the Jews, the Bible Society, and the Temperance Society. Indeed it was while working for this latter that she was taken ill of the sickness which cut short her life.

Both were interested in others and blessed others immeasurably; yet both experienced the loneliness of qualitative difference—even while at school. "I stood alone," wrote F.R.H. of her school life at Düsseldorf, "I do not think there was one beside myself who cared for religion." For Thérèse Martin also, school days were not days of friendship. She was very good at her lessons, but very serious. She could not or did not care to play games, so she was unpopular. Thus loneliness is not only the lot of the great, but also of the good. It was their totality of devotion to the Crucified which, despite this loneliness, fed their divine intention of saving souls, even at the cost of suffering and death.

Yes, both had a passion for souls; and both could have prayed the

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

prayer of F.R.H., "Lord, take my lips and speak through them, take my mind and think through it, take my heart and set it on fire." Both loved, supremely, their Lord; and both looked forward with anticipation to being with him forever. It is not without significance that "heaven" was the first word the child Thérèse Martin learned to read. All her life she thought of heaven with gladness; and when the end came she welcomed it as a door opening into the eternal presence of the Beloved Jesus. So did F.R.H. Long before the end of her life she said, "I think my special anticipation of heaven is seeing the Lord Jesus exalted, glorified, vindicated, reigning as King of Kings." When at last she learned that all remedies for her peritonitis had failed, she whispered, "It's home the faster!"

So they both died young. Perhaps there is in both cases a patent lack of worldly wisdom and common prudence, which might have prolonged their lives. Even a sympathetic biographer of Soeur Thérèse, Miss Sackville-West, admits that the Prioress¹⁷ of the Carmelite House at Lisieux must have been strangely unobservant, or most unsympathetic, if she could not see Soeur Thérèse's true state of health; particularly as a young novice had noticed the nun's livid face and great exhaustion and implored her not to go on taxing her strength cleaning windows! Both, however, were oblivious to their own welfare. Soeur Thérèse had acquired the habit of never excusing herself or complaining; and the week before her last brief illness, F.R.H. was permitted, although in ill health, to conduct her temperance endeavors "on the village bank." The day was cold and damp; and she returned home wet and chilled by the mist and rain. This was May 21st. A few days later she had to give up the strenuous pace. She died on June 3, 1879.

V

Despite this selection of likenesses—and there are many others, for each experienced visions, ecstasies, answers to prayer, dark nights of the soul, and other vicissitudes of the mystic way—it is certainly the differences between these two Christians which make their greatest impression. That is why the likenesses have been mentioned. Augustine, commenting upon the first chapter of John said, "‘In the beginning was the Word.’ *Behold Him to whom Mary hearkened.* ‘And the Word became flesh.’ *Behold Him whom Martha served.*" There is some such distinction between the sanctity of F.R.H. and Soeur Thérèse. "To give our Lord a perfect hospitality," said Teresa of Avila, "Mary and Martha must combine." This

¹⁷ Not her sister, but Mother Mary of Gonzaga.

is true. Our Lord made that clear in his declaration, "My sheep hear my voice *and* they follow me." Nevertheless it is usually true that one or the other attitude is primary; and sometimes, as in the case of the two saints we are considering, it is distinctive. In Soeur Thérèse there is some of Martha, but more of Mary. In F.R.H. there is much of Mary, yet more of Martha.

Soeur Thérèse, despite the fact that she is considered a miniature of perfect saintliness, has been called a lowbrow among the saints. She herself confesses, "I am a very little soul, and can offer to God only very little things."¹⁸ In contrast, F.R.H. could be called a highbrow; for in education, learning, mind, talents, opportunity and musical, literary, and poetical output, she is far above the humble Soeur Thérèse. Teresa of Avila, who wanted girls with brains, would have welcomed F.R.H. Thérèse Martin she might have refused because her mind was undeveloped.

Nevertheless there are deeper differences with which we must be concerned. For one thing F.R.H. was clearly the active type, while Soeur Thérèse was the passive type. Yet even this must be qualified; for Soeur Thérèse saw clearly that "even the highest aspirations are of no value without good works."¹⁹ And although F.R.H. said, "I want to make the most of my life, and do the best with it," the word "surrender" loomed large in her spiritual vocabulary. There must be surrender, she affirmed; "and there can be a renewal of surrender; and there may also be a *fuller* surrender."²⁰

We begin to discern the essential difference between these saints when we consider how they regarded Christ, and themselves in relation to him. For Soeur Thérèse, Christ was the Child Jesus. She called herself his "little flower." She humbly looked upon herself as only worthy to be his toy—a "little ball" of no value. She also considered her dedication as a spiritual marriage. She looked upon herself as the wife of Jesus. After taking the veil she drew up a quaint card, as from the King of Heaven, announcing the marriage of his Son with Thérèse Martin. She regarded her duty as being to amuse her Heavenly Lover; to love him and make others love him; and to follow him obediently into the uttermost fellowship of suffering.

F.R.H. looked upon Christ as her King. When she was ill with typhoid she rejoiced in the possibility that she would soon see her King. She pre-

¹⁸ *A Little White Flower*, p. 229.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

²⁰ *Memorials*, pp. 126-127.

sented Christ thus in such books as *My King*, *The Royal Invitation*, *Royal Commandments*, *Royal Bounty*. Yet her favorite title for Christ was "Master." Commenting on her hymn, "O Master, at Thy feet I bow in rapture sweet," she said: "O Master! It is perhaps my favorite title, because it implies rule and submission; and that is what love craves." The thought is similar to that of Soeur Thérèse, but F.R.H. regarded herself rather as Christ's tool—something to be wholly consecrated to and "kept for the Master's use." She was Christ's to serve—his handmaiden rather than his bride. Thus while the sanctity of Soeur Thérèse was that of renunciation, of acceptance, of submission and subordination, even of self-abasement; the sanctity of F.R.H. was that of dedication, of stewardship, of self-transcendence in sacrificial service, of talents applied to cogent spiritual ends. "Writing," she once said, "is praying with me." Soeur Thérèse was a saint of the shut door. F.R.H. was a saint of the open door.

Christ has been called the suffering Servant of God. His life was a perfect combination of service and suffering. Perhaps we could differentiate between the lives of these two saints by naming that of F.R.H., Sanctity in Service; and that of Soeur Thérèse, Sanctity in Suffering. Yet the distinction seems contrived. They both wanted "the all"; and "to obtain the All," said St. John of the Cross, "one must abandon all." Each in her own way, and according to her mind, did exactly that; and each in the richness of her spiritual experience found that he whom she loved was wholly true. "I love him. My God, I love you"; exclaimed Soeur Thérèse as she died. "I am lost in amazement," said F.R.H. "There hath not failed one word of all his good promise"; and, like Soeur Thérèse, in the hour of death, as in all the moments of her life, she looked up "as if she saw the Lord." That, after all, is the secret of sanctity: "*Dieu sensible au coeur.*" Indeed, it is the end of man.

James Montgomery and His Contribution to English Hymnody

JOHN H. JOHANSEN

IN ANY ACCOUNT of the development of the English hymn, the name of James Montgomery must occupy a place of high honor. All church hymnals contain the songs of Isaac Watts, Charles Wesley, and Montgomery; the first two the chief hymn writers of the eighteenth century, and the last named of the nineteenth.

The chief facts concerning the life of James Montgomery may be briefly summarized. He was born on November 4, 1771, in Irvine in Ayrshire, Scotland, the region so long famous as the native place of Robert Burns. When he was about five years old, his father, who was a Moravian minister, removed to Grace Hill, a settlement of the Moravians near Ballymena, Ireland, and shortly afterwards to Fulneck, in Yorkshire, England. Thus, by the time he was eight years old, the child had resided in Scotland, Ireland, and England.

Young Montgomery received his early education at the boys' school in Fulneck, the chief Moravian settlement in England, and it was while he was here at school that his parents died, in 1783, on the island of Barbados in the West Indies, to which they had gone as missionaries. When he was sixteen years old, James was apprenticed to a grocer at Mirfield, near Wakefield, from whom he ran away two years later and became a shop-boy at Wath, Yorkshire. He was already writing poetry, and in 1790 went to London to secure its publication. The publisher, Mr. Harrison, refused the manuscript but engaged Montgomery's services as shopman, and from this time forth he was engaged in newspaper work.

After leaving London, Montgomery returned to Wath, then in 1792 he removed to Sheffield as assistant to Mr. Gales, publisher of the "Sheffield Register," a paper of revolutionary tendencies. Gales was threatened with prosecution for his political utterances and fled to America, and Montgomery secured the paper for himself. He changed its name to the "Sheffield Iris" and continued to edit and publish it from July, 1794, to

JOHN H. JOHANSEN, S.T.M., is pastor of the First Moravian Church, New Philadelphia, Ohio. He writes of a hymn writer not too well known, but some of whose contributions now appear indispensable.

July, 1825. His reform principles, however, did not meet with the favor of the authorities. Soon after becoming an editor he was fined twenty pounds and imprisoned for three months for having printed a poem, "The Bastille," surmounted by a woodcut representing Liberty and the British Lion. Two years later, in 1796, he was found guilty of sedition, fined thirty pounds, and imprisoned for six months, on account of reflections upon a colonel of militia published in his paper. These experiences however only added to his reputation, and when he retired from the editorial care of his paper, he was entertained at a public banquet, and at his death received the honors of a public funeral.

Montgomery lectured in various places on poetry, notably at the Royal Institution, London, in 1830-31, and he was in demand for many religious gatherings, particularly those of missionary organizations and the Bible Society. In 1833 his literary successes and his Christian character had won universal regard, and the government, perhaps to atone for its former severity, gave him an annual pension of two hundred pounds. So he passed into a beautiful and serene old age. Like Cowper, to whom he has been likened,¹ he was never married. He was forty-three years old when he made a public profession of religion, coming back to the little church of his boyhood. The first stanza of the poem which he composed respecting his readmission to the Moravian congregation at Fulneck reads:

People of the living God,
I have sought the world around;
Paths of sin and sorrow trod,
Peace and comfort nowhere found;
Now to you my spirit turns,
Turns a fugitive unblest;
Brethren, where your altar burns,
O receive me into rest!

Theodore Cuyler, in his autobiography, gives an interesting account of his call upon the venerable poet in 1832. He describes him as "a short, brisk, cheery old man. His complexion was fresh and snowy hair crowned a noble forehead."²

When seriously ill and quite advanced in years, Montgomery once offered some of his hymns to his attending physician that they might be read aloud to him. But he became very much affected by them, saying that every one embodied some distinct experience, and adding that he hoped

¹ Montgomery has been called "the Cowper of the nineteenth century." See John Greenfield, *James Montgomery, Moravian Hymn Writer*. Albany: Frank H. Evory & Co., p. 5.

² Quoted by David R. Breed, *The History and Use of Hymns and Hymn-Tunes*. Fleming H. Revell Co., 1903, p. 154.

they might be profitable to others from this fact. His death occurred April 30, 1854, during his sleep.

Montgomery was blessed with a robust constitution, and crowded into his life a large volume of literary activity.

(1) He began to write poetry as a boy, and was, as Dr. Benson puts it, "a facile poet in the narrative and descriptive manner."³ Among his longer poems are "Prison Amusements," 1797, written during his first imprisonment in York Castle; "The Ocean," 1805; "The Wanderer of Switzerland," 1806; "The West Indies," 1810, which Duffield says was "an anti-slavery document of the most impressive sort"⁴; "The World Before the Flood," 1813, and "Greenland," 1819, based on the history of Moravian missions. He also wrote "The Pelican Island," 1826, and the short pieces collected in "The Poet's Portfolio" of 1835. All of these appealed to a large public, mostly the religious public who valued such pure sentiments in the form of verse they could read and understand.

(2) Montgomery's fame today rests exclusively upon his hymns. His other works are scarcely known and hardly ever read. Of the four hundred hymns which he has written, more than a hundred are still in common use. Many of them first appeared in newspapers, and were collected in *The Songs of Zion, being Imitations of the Psalms*, 1822; *The Christian Psalmist, or Hymns, Selected and Original*, 1825; and *Original Hymns for Public, Private, and Social Devotion*, 1853.

As a hymn writer James Montgomery covers a large number of topics and touches a wide range of Christian doctrine and experience, and many of his hymns were written for the festival days of the church year. His great advent, or Christmas, hymn is well known:

Angels, from the realms of glory,
Wing your flight o'er all the earth;
Ye who sang creation's story,
Now proclaim Messiah's birth;
Come and worship—come and worship—
Worship Christ, the new-born king.

A well-known critic has given this hymn this high praise: "For comprehensiveness, appropriateness of expression, force and elevation of sentiment, it may challenge comparison with any hymn that was ever written, in any language or country."⁵

The Epiphany follows so soon after Christmas that many people think

³ Louis F. Benson, *The Hymnody of the Christian Church*. George H. Doran Co., 1927, p. 126.

⁴ Samuel W. Duffield, *English Hymns: Their Authors and History*. Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1886, p. 482.

⁵ Duffield, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

of them as one. It really commemorates the visit of the Wise Men, and when the Church selected a Scripture reading for that occasion it wanted a passage that would foretell the homage that would come from all the nations to Christ, of which the visit of the Wise Men was the beginning. That is why the seventy-second Psalm was selected as the reading for that day. And what is perhaps Montgomery's finest hymn is really the seventy-second Psalm in metre. As a version it suffers nothing by comparison with that of Watts.

Hail to the Lord's anointed,
Great David's greater Son!
Hail, in the time appointed,
His reign on earth begun!
He comes to break oppression,
To set the captive free,
To take away transgression,
And rule in equity.

O'er every foe victorious,
He on his throne shall rest;
From age to age more glorious,
All-blessing and all-blessed.
The tide of time shall never
His covenant remove;
His name shall stand forever,
His great, best name of Love.

This hymn was written originally as a Christmas ode and was sung at one of the Moravian settlements in England, on December 25, 1821. The next April, Montgomery attended a Wesleyan missionary meeting in Liverpool, where he was one of the speakers. He closed his address by reciting the words of this hymn, and we can imagine that it was not spoken or heard without a perceptible thrill. Dr. Adam Clarke, who presided at the meeting, was so impressed that he secured a copy, and in 1822 appended the hymn to his notes on the seventy-second Psalm in his now famous *Commentary on the Bible*.

Montgomery is known by two other fine missionary hymns. What can be more triumphant than his "Song of Jubilee"?

Hark! the song of jubilee,
Loud as mighty thunders roar,
Or the fullness of the sea,
When it breaks upon the shore;
Hallelujah! for the Lord
God omnipotent shall reign!
Hallelujah! let the word
Echo round the earth and main.

His third missionary hymn is "Lift up your Heads, ye Gates of Brass."

Perhaps Montgomery's most popular hymn, the one by which he is best known, is the one entitled "What Is Prayer?" The Christian world has claimed and used it in public worship until it is a classic which is assured a permanent place. We quote the first and last stanzas:

Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
Uttered or unexpressed;
The motion of a hidden fire
That trembles in the breast.

O Thou, by whom we come to God,
The Life, the Truth, the Way,
The path of prayer Thyself hast trod,
Lord, teach us how to pray.

On one other theme the hymns of James Montgomery are also outstanding. His favorite theme is the Cross. The comment of Addison* concerning early Moravian hymnology may well be applied to the hymns of Montgomery: "The chief burden of the hymns was *Ecce Homo*." This can be seen in a hymn for Maundy Thursday:

According to Thy gracious word,
In deep humility,
This will I do, my dying Lord,
I will remember Thee.

It is shown also in his great hymn for Good Friday:

Go to dark Gethsemane,
Ye that feel the tempter's power;
Your Redeemer's conflict see,
Watch with Him one bitter hour;
Turn not from His griefs away,
Learn of Jesus Christ to pray.

Another Holy Week hymn expressing this fact of the Christian faith is the following:

In the hour of trial,
Jesus, plead for me;
Lest by base denial
I depart from Thee;
When Thou seest me waver,
With a look recall,
Nor for fear or favor
Suffer me to fall.

* William G. Addison, *The Renewed Church of the United Brethren*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1932, p. 123.

Without going into further detail as to the individual hymns of Montgomery, it remains true that he rendered two outstanding services to English hymnody.

(1) Montgomery was largely responsible, though indirectly so, for the introduction into the Anglican Church of hymns "of human composition." Under the influence of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, England at the Reformation followed the Calvinistic pattern of public praise, and only the metrical psalms were used in the services of the church. The Rev. Thomas Cotterill, curate of St. Paul's Church in Sheffield, and a good friend of Montgomery's, tried to alter this situation and attempted to introduce in the Anglican Church the hymns of Watts, Cowper, and Newton. Cotterill published *A Selection of Psalms and Hymns*, which became popular elsewhere, then he attempted to introduce this selection in his own congregation; and he asked Montgomery to help him revise and improve the work. Montgomery's biographers tell of the event in these words: "To this 'labor of love,' the poet readily consented; contributing not only the benefit of his judgment in the choice and amendment of available compositions from various quarters, but a number of his own best hymns."⁷

When Archbishop Harcourt saw the revised hymnal, he gave permission for it to be dedicated to himself and allowed its use in St. Paul's Church. This resulted in breaking down the persisting opposition, as all over England Harcourt's attitude was accepted as authorizing the general use of hymns in the services of the Church. Thus we today are gratefully indebted to both Montgomery and Archbishop Harcourt for the increased and unhampered usage of modern hymns in Anglican general worship.

(2) Montgomery composed a number of hymns which no subsequent collection laying claim to anything like completeness has been able to omit. He cannot be rated with Watts and Wesley, but as Dr. Breed has pointed out, "few surpass him in positive usefulness. And after all, what better standard can we raise than this?"⁸

Montgomery deals with the greatest themes of Christian experience, and he deals with them with a cosmic range and sweep. Obvious examples of such hymns, in addition to those already quoted, are "The Lord is my Shepherd," "Thy law is perfect, Lord of Light," "Come to Calvary's holy mountain," "O Spirit of the living God," "Pour out thy Spirit from on

⁷ John Holland and James Everett, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of James Montgomery* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1885), Vol. III, p. 158.

⁸ Breed, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

high," "To thy temple we repair," "Holy, holy, holy Lord," "Oh! where shall rest be found?" "Work while it is today," and "Forever with the Lord," one stanza of which was pronounced by Dr. Cuyler as fine as anything in hymnody.

The secrets of Montgomery's power as a hymn writer are many. His poetic ability was of high order, and he was also one of the best literary critics of his day. He ably criticized the hymn writings of his predecessors, usually kindly criticism, and his insight and impartiality made his criticisms valuable. His ear for rhythm was refined. His knowledge of the Scriptures was thorough. His religious sympathies were broad and charitable. And so his hymns unite the faith of a strong man to the beauty and simplicity of a child. In the words of the Psalmist:

"And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her: and the highest himself shall establish her. The Lord shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there. As well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there: all my springs are in Thee." (Psalms 87:5-7).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bailey, Albert Edward, *The Gospel In Hymns*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.
- Breed, David R., *The History and Use of Hymns and Hymn-Tunes*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1903.
- Duffield, Samuel W., *English Hymns: Their Authors and History*. Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1886.
- Greenfield, John, *James Montgomery, Moravian Hymn Writer*. Albany: Frank H. Evory & Co. Reprinted from *The Biblical Review*.
- Holland, John, and Everett, James, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of James Montgomery*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1855, 7 Vols.
- Knight, Helen C., *Life of James Montgomery*. Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1857.
- Marks, Harvey B., *The Rise and Growth of English Hymnody*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1937.

What America Owes to George Whitefield

ALBERT D. BELDEN

IT WAS ON MAY 7th, 1738, that three little vessels entered the Port of Savannah, Georgia. From one of them, the "Whitaker," there landed a young man, George Whitefield, whose story is the greatest romance in the history of Protestant preaching. Though only twenty-three years of age, his name was already a household word the length and breadth of England, where he had blazed the trail of the Methodist message before John Wesley was converted. He had come out to Georgia to assist John and Charles Wesley, only to find that they had failed in their work in the colony and returned to England. Whitefield then began that program of amazing revivalism throughout the American colonies which not only changed countless lives, but also stamped the Evangelical Faith indelibly upon the new nation which was coming into being.

This was the first of seven visits that the young English preacher was to pay the colonies, and each time his fame grew greater. Thirteen times he crossed the Atlantic, in days when one such voyage was deemed a great adventure, and never in a vessel bigger than fifty tons, and for the sole purpose of commending Christ to the American people. Amid his innumerable journeys over all the eastern seaboard states, his greatest preachings occurred in such important cities as Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, where literally the whole populations of the cities turned out into the streets to hear him. On one occasion when he preached in Philadelphia, that careful investigator, Benjamin Franklin, who was for thirty years a close friend and admirer of Whitefield, took the opportunity of confirming a rumor that he had heard as to the phenomenal character of George Whitefield's voice. He writes:

Whitefield preached one evening from the top of the Courthouse steps, which are in the middle of Market Street and on the west side of Second Street, which crosses it at right-angles. Both streets were filled with hearers to a considerable distance and being amongst the hindmost in Market Street, I had the curiosity to learn how far he could be heard, by retiring backward down the street toward the river,

ALBERT D. BELDEN, B.D., D.D., is pastor of King's Cross Central Mission, London, and author of *Pax Christi* and *George Whitefield the Awakener*. A prominent British Congregationalist and General Director of the Pax Christi League, he has visited the United States and Canada six times, preaching and lecturing.

and I found his voice distinct till I came near Front Street. I computed that he might well be heard by more than thirty thousand people. This reconciled me to the newspaper accounts of his having preached to twenty-five thousand in the fields.

Whitefield's greatest open-air meeting in America was a multitude of sixty thousand on Boston Common. Perhaps the most precious relic of the Evangelical Revival is the little collapsible open-air pulpit which George Whitefield used and which is now in the possession of the American Tract Society, New York. It is estimated that from this pulpit alone he preached the gospel, with overwhelming power every time, to no less than ten million souls in England, Wales, Scotland, and America. No man secured such a hearing for the gospel amongst the common people in all the history of Protestant Christianity. In New England alone thirty thousand people (a very large figure for the Colonies of those days) are said to have been vitally changed, and great tides of religious revival spread out in every direction from such achievements. In one such flood of revival pouring down into Kentucky, the home of a family named Lincoln was caught, and as a distant result the early years of the future Abolition President were to receive the impress of Christ. It was by the simple *reading* of Whitefield's printed sermons, for which a special meetinghouse was built, that the Presbyterian Church of the State of Virginia came into being. Dr. Abel Stevens, in his history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, writes:

The Congregational Church of New England, the Presbyterians and Baptists of the Middle States, and the mixed colonies of the south, owe their later religious life and energy to the impulses given by Whitefield's powerful administrations . . . the New England Churches received an inspiration of zeal and energy which has never died out. Whitefield prepared the way for Wesley's itinerants. When he descended into his American grave, they were already on his track.

There can scarcely be a Christian denomination on the American continent that has not benefited directly or indirectly from the work of this greatest evangelist of Protestant history.

Although theologically Whitefield was a Calvinist, he had a marvelous catholicity of spirit and was ready to co-operate with all churches that would do so with him. A capital instance of this, as well as of his humor, occurred once when he was preaching from the courthouse balcony in Philadelphia. Lifting his head and staring into the heavens, he cried suddenly with a tremendous voice, "Father Abraham, whom have you up there? Any Episcopalians?" Then he brought a faint "No!" from the sky. "Any Presbyterians, or Independents?" Another faint "No!" "Have you any

Methodists up there?" This time slightly louder, "No! No! No!" "Well, but Father Abraham, whom have you up there?" he cried again. "We know none up here save Christians," came the firm reply. Whitefield, turning to the crowd, cried, "O if that be true, let us know none but Christians here below!"

On another occasion one of his partisans, unmindful of Whitefield's great love for Wesley, came to him with a foolish question, "Do you think we shall see Mr. Wesley in heaven?" "No, sir," Whitefield thundered in reply, "we shall not see Mr. Wesley in heaven, he will be so near to the Throne and you and I will be so far from it that we shall not see Mr. Wesley." That "we" is delicious!

There is more, however, than a religious debt on America's part to George Whitefield. He was also the pioneer in philanthropy and in education. In an age of cruelty, when the sympathetic social imagination of mankind was undeveloped and incredibly dull, he moved up and down the two great portions of the English-speaking world teaching them to see the woes and perils of distant sufferers and to taste the joy of the generous heart. He founded the first orphanage on American soil, which is now the oldest American charity. It is at Bethesda, near Savannah, and is today still a flourishing institution. It celebrates its 200th anniversary this year. Whitefield took a great collection in his Tottenham Court Road Chapel for the sufferers in the fire of Boston. From the beginning of his great ministry in London he seemed to know how to charm money out of people, but the great collections that he took, both from audiences indoors and his vast open-air congregations, he gave away freely for the relief of the miserable poor of his time.

Benjamin Franklin, who could be close-fisted on occasion, was one of his victims in this regard. Having had a slight quarrel with Whitefield about the site of the proposed orphanage, Franklin refused him any more subscriptions, but "poor Richard," to use Franklin's pseudonym, had not reckoned with his friend's oratory.

I happened [he says] soon afterwards to attend one of his sermons and I silently resolved he should get nothing from me. I had in my pocket a handful of copper money, three or four silver dollars, and five in gold. As he proceeded I began to soften and concluded to give the copper. Another stroke of his oratory made me ashamed and determined me to give the silver, and he finished so admirably that I emptied my pocket into the collection dish, gold and all.

America's debt to Whitefield in the field of education is incalculable. It was from his work that some of its earliest and most renowned educational

institutions sprang. In the dormitory triangle of the University of Pennsylvania a most noble statue of the great preacher, by Dr. R. Tait MacKenzie, bears the following inscription: "The inspirer and original Trustee of the Charity School of 1740, the forerunner of the University of Pennsylvania, he solicited the first donations to the library of the University of Pennsylvania, guided the new School of learning by his godly counsel, heartened it by his masterly preaching, and inspired it with his noble life." Upon another panel appears the further tribute: "Zealous advocate and patron of higher education in the American colonies."

His interest in the Old Log College, founded by the celebrated Presbyterian family of Tennents, so stimulated its growth that eventually it was removed from Neshaminy, near Philadelphia, to become New Jersey College, where it later blossomed into Princeton University. On the old site at Neshaminy there stands now a stone memorial bearing the names of fifty-three colleges of Presbyterian foundation covering the whole of the United States, many of which have become universities, and whose origin lies rooted in Whitefield's work. Further, it was George Whitefield who secured the financial support and interest of the Earl of Dartmouth for the founding of Dartmouth College in New Hampshire; and he also placed both Harvard and Yale Universities under some obligation by his activities—refounding, for example, Harvard Library after the great fire of Boston.

The most significant bond between America and Great Britain is that of evangelical faith; and next to the Puritan ancestors of the great Republic, George Whitefield may be considered most responsible for forging that bond. For it he gave his very life, expiring after a most singular sermon at Newburyport, near Boston, having literally killed himself by preaching.

He preached this last sermon, standing in great weakness, upon the staircase of the church manse in Newburyport. His audience crowded the house and the street. He preached until the candle he was holding burnt itself out in the socket of the candlestick. He then stumbled upstairs to bed, and died in the early morning.

His remains lie in a little crypt beneath the pulpit of the Old South Presbyterian Church there. For nearly two hundred years the skeleton was on view through the glass-topped coffin. My renowned predecessor, Charles Silvester Horne, endeavoured to put an end to this exhibition, but in vain. I, in my turn, resumed the effort, endeavoring to get the bones

presented by the American Nation to Great Britain for interment in Westminster Abbey, where the bones of Wesley have been honored with a resting place, though with no greater right than that which belongs to the Pioneer Evangelist of the greatest of all Protestant Revivals. Although that gift was refused, with great good taste the officers of Newburyport Church recently closed the crypt to the public.

It is well to recall Whitefield's personality and work in these days of crisis when the Evangelical Faith needs as never before the full loyalty of the English-speaking peoples of the world.

Having Deposed Zeus

CALVIN T. RYAN

THE MEN WHO RETURNED from World War II were a rather sobered group. Those who entered college, for the most part, have proved themselves worthy.

But the boys and girls who were in high school during the war years seem to have had special training in sloth, to have developed a special technique for "getting by," with no sense of or obligation for what is right. They became accustomed to much thunder, much noise, and they seem to think that life is mostly thunder. As the Greek dramatist said, they live where "Whirl is King, having deposed Zeus."

Even among the adults, the parents of these young people, we find what has been aptly called a spiritual uncertainty, or even more accurately, a "spiritual fog." As a character in a modern novel is made to say, "She was destined to shop for cheap values." Not having taste for the higher, the better values, they shop for the cheaper. Children brought up in homes with such spiritual fog filling every room would naturally "unerringly celebrate the mediocre."

It is indisputably true that whenever man loses the image of God in his own concepts, he likewise loses the image of man. When that happens, certainly we live in a spiritual uncertainty. For "Whirl is King, having deposed Zeus." A dear lady of this kingdom of whirl said, "Last night I could not think of anywhere to go, or anything to do. I thought I must have forgotten some promise to call on some friend. I just went to the phone and called two or three friends and asked them whether I had promised to call that evening." For such, obviously all life is thunder and noise, and they can neither "Be still, and know that I am God," nor distinguish between thunder and the voice of the angel. All is whirl.

It may have taken the Second World War to destroy the materialistic optimist's belief in inevitable progress, and some scions of humanism to allow their faith in mere knowledge to be shattered. We should know by now that it does not matter greatly how much knowledge a person may have acquired, or how many scientific facts. Tennyson was right:

CALVIN T. RYAN, A.M., Ed.M., is Head of the Languages Department and Acting Head of the Fine Arts Department, State Teachers College, Kearney, Nebraska. He describes and prescribes for the contemporary "cult of confusion."

Who loves not Knowledge? Who shall rail
Against her beauty?

But

..... Let her know her place;
She is the second, not the first.¹

It is when knowledge is put first that God is deposed. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen well expresses it when he writes: "Probably none of the Apostles called by Our Lord said, 'Now, I must begin to be a good man'; they said, instead, 'Now, I must begin to do His Will.'" That Msgr. Sheen calls "Deoverion."²

David Lawrence wrote last year in *U. S. News & World Report*, "Yes, that's what's wrong with the world—we proclaim ourselves idealists, but at heart we are materialists. We tend to push aside the preachments of Judeo-Christianity as obsolete, as inapplicable to modern circumstances."

At heart we are materialists partly because we have followed knowledge canalized in the field of science when science declared itself independent of the church and religion. Likewise, our environment, the general climate of opinion, these have stressed knowledge, progress, and power. They are the ones who have made the thunder. They have been the whirl which we have declared king, "having deposed Zeus."

With no intention of minimizing the significance of science in the modern world, a man of some depth of scholarship and no little power of thought was speaking at a banquet given for a group of college students, selected for their high scholastic standing and obvious leadership ability. In essence, here is what the man told those young scholars. "The case for scholarship has been well established. But the scholar of tomorrow's world will need more metaphysics than physics, more psychology than zoology; he will give more attention to the 'word' than to the 'loaf.' Jesus gave the dictum that man shall not live by bread alone. The scholar must be interested in that other part of man's need." For this speaker, as for David Lawrence, "the preachments of Judeo-Christianity" are not obsolete.

Two or three decades ago, we had our hopes raised high by the claims of technology, then the new and most attention-getting point in science. We were told it would take care of food production, of manufacturing, of all the needs of man in his enviable Utopia. Obviously there was no need of Msgr. Sheen's Deoverion, or the Apostle's decision to do His will.

Since that time we have had an unforgettable depression and a most

¹ In *Memoriam*, Canto CXIV.

² Sheen, F. J., *Lift Up Your Hearts*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950.

horrible war, and as yet only a remote promise of peace before another war utterly consumes us, if it does not destroy us. We have more starving people than at any other time in the century. We have an increasing number of mental diseases. We have a plebeian distrust of any emphasis upon decency and order. David Lawrence in the article referred to earlier is more severe, for he says, "Maybe the true reason why we cannot approach our enemies with a hand of fellowship is because our hand is covered with the stain of guilt." C. E. M. Joad thinks that the taste of the masses may become so vitiated that they will no longer want anything better. Is there any wonder that we have a recognizable cult of confusion? Man, with all his blown confidence in his own ability, acts as though the laws of God did not exist—or existing, had no meaning. Is it not patent that in such a climate of opinion we should have a blackout of the Kingdom of Heaven?

Whenever man loses the image of God, he loses the image of man also, except that part of him which remains animal. Having suffered both losses, what is the Kingdom of Heaven to him? The idea of the "noble savage" has a strong appeal to those who are unwilling to submit to the discipline of the creature "made a little lower than the angels." Richard Guggenheimer says in his *Sight and Insight*, "There is always a great market in human gullibility for loud assertion delivered with bravura fortissima."³ The romantic appeal of savage innocence is immediate, demands less courage, and requires much less effort than living according to the highest within us. The decadent tries to convince the world that the enjoyment of Utopia today is better than the Kingdom of God tomorrow—if tomorrow. As Dr. Dietrich von Hildebrand writes of the man who lacks in reverence, "Stubbornly imprisoned in his own self, he violates being, and seeing it only from the outside, he thus misses its true meaning." So lives the man who has no interest in the Kingdom of God.

When man loses the image of his God, there is no obvious reason for his being concerned with a higher and lower. Perfection, the job done well, may have been devoutly preached by old Tom Carlyle last century, but the labor union makes no mention of first-rate and second-rate performances. H. G. Wells says somewhere that we have a large number of what he so pointedly calls the "dull unkilld." They are the men and women interested in sloth rather than work; in getting by rather than in doing the work well. They are happy with the second-rate in work as well as in play. "The public, as a whole, is vulgar and likes only what is

³ Harper & Brothers, 1945, p. 171.

vulgar," is the remark of a rather harsh contemporary French philosopher. Perhaps that is a hard saying, we hope even exaggerated; nevertheless, we learn that the publishers of Edgar Allen Poe's works said that they had to pay him less than others, "because he wrote better than others." Poe was too much of an artist, too much of a perfectionist in style, to cultivate what another writer called the "zoocracy."

So long as the *law of nature* was synonymous with the Law of God,

That God, which ever lives and loves,
One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves,⁴

man could keep the image of God before him, in him, and think in terms of the Kingdom of God. But in time, for some persons at least, the *law of nature* became synonymous with jungle law, and man became a roving animal. As soon as that happens, it is patent we can no longer have a law of man *and* a law of the jungle; they become the same law.

Insofar as I recall, there is nothing in the New Testament concerning the *law of nature*, but there we can find much proof as to the certainty of what man is intended to be. The natural law of man, biblically interpreted, is to grow into the likeness of God.

Although there is no single reference in the Bible to lead one to think of the Kingdom of God as a place of luxurious surroundings, or to make Paradise synonymous with a Utopian city where all is ease and comfort, one fears that the popular notion is just that. We have lived in a frame of reference where belief in the salvation by machinery is made exceedingly easy.

No one can thumb through the advertising pages of our popular magazines and not be impressed with the idea of comfort as the great American desideratum. We are impressed by the number of gadgets made especially for our *comfort*, and the number of foods particularly prepared for our needs. Action depends on belief, as any advertiser knows. Furthermore, he knows that belief is a matter of feeling and emotion rather than of reason. For that reason the advertiser doesn't want the reader to think. He wants him to feel, to desire. He wants him to feel that all that matters is the material; all that exists is what the eye sees. There is no reminder of the Temple of the Spirit, no suggestion that a life of contemplation is ever advisable. The advertiser has become the voice of civilization.

⁴ Tennyson, *In Memoriam*.

This spoiled-child psychology has left the impression that if we just leave the whole matter to science, to technology, there is nothing we cannot have, nothing that will make our existence on earth one round of luxurious comfort. "It is through suffering that learning comes," therefore we hold our desire to learn in abeyance.

Dr. Pitirim A. Sorokin thinks man is made up of many selves, of many egos, and all these are acting and reacting in the milieu of society round about them. The degree of harmony between these pulls will determine whether the individual has a happy and acceptable personality. If they pull together, harmonize, they will give the individual the equipoise necessary for successful living. If they pull in contrary directions, the individual suffers spiritually, mentally, and physically. Furthermore, Dr. Sorokin thinks there must be some integrating force to bring about harmony. Since the effect on society as a whole is the same as on the individual, Dr. Sorokin says, "The essence of these norms for intergroup and interindividual relations has been sublimely formulated in the Sermon on the Mount, and in the Golden Rule."⁵

Before there was any blackout of the Kingdom of God, the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule were that integrating force, and still are, for those who, like Christian, still think they can see the light in the Celestial City. For all such, neither one has ever seemed impracticable. But with the acceptance of other gods, obviously these teachings have lost their integrating power. Nevertheless, as Dr. Sorokin warns, unless we can return to them, we shall continue to live in a house divided against itself.

As Richard M. Weaver pointed out in *Ideas Have Consequences*, "Culture consists, in truth, of many little things; but they are not armrests and soft beds and extravagant bathing facilities."⁶ Those things go with our this-worldliness, and keep us here, while they help black out the Kingdom of God. They make us not only live in this world, but try to make us like it; perhaps prefer it. Liking it, we fail to look upward to the source of all light. But any study of civilization, of the great men and women who have left a priceless heritage, will convince us that the price of heroism is hardness. The "plain living and high thinking" of Wordsworth is the stuff of heroes. The dictum of Jesus that we are to seek first the Kingdom of Heaven, Jesus himself demonstrated, and so have many of his followers in the intervening years. Tasting life to the full is not to

⁵ Sorokin, P. A., *Society, Culture, and Personality*. Harper & Brothers, 1947, p. 355.

⁶ University of Chicago Press, 1948.

be forever doing or forever acquiring. It is making action and contemplation complementary.

It could be as Dr. Sigfried Giedion has predicted, "Future generations will perhaps designate this period [our own times] as one of mechanized barbarism, the most repulsive barbarism of all."⁷ The period in which Jesus was born was one of great expectation. The Jews were actively waiting to see what God would do to redeem the world. Ours too is an age of great expectation, but we must admit that till recently it has been more nearly an expectation of what tomorrow's *man* will do, what new invention he will perfect. Having traded God for gadgets, we no longer look up but down. As Dr. Giedion says, "Never has mankind possessed so many instruments for abolishing slavery. But the promises of a better life have not been kept. All we have to show so far is a rather disquieting inability to organize the world, or even to organize ourselves."⁸

In every branch of thought we find that a synthesis of the outer and the inner, the integrating of forces which pull on our lives, the organizing of ourselves, an effort to bring man into equipoise, are now being accounted *musts*. That is, man is beginning to take stock of his predicament which had its beginning largely in the post-Renaissance shift from the spiritual man to the natural man—in what Lawrence Hyde has called so descriptively, "the substitution of human for transcendental standards in every department of life."⁹

When the President's Committee reported to President Truman on scientific progress, especially in the field of medicine and surgery, Dr. Bush, the chairman, admitted the limits of science. The next step is to find out more about man, say these men. Scientific progress has so far outdistanced our understanding of the moral and the spiritual that our problem now is to bring a balance between them. Millikan of the California Institute of Technology has admitted, "The trend is toward God, all right. Or rather, it is away from his enemies." Perhaps we may say the trend is toward removing the king of whirl.

All mankind is not now and never has been both blind and indifferent to the sovereignty of Whirl. The Kingdom of God may have suffered an apparent blackout, but we should be prodigal enough to admit the condition may have come upon us somewhat unawares, so subtle, so persistent has it been. But if we become aware of such a condition, ours and our neigh-

⁷ Giedion, Sigfried, *Mechanization Takes Command*. Oxford University Press, 1948, p. 715.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 715.

⁹ Hyde, Lawrence, *Isis and Osiris*. E. P. Dutton & Company, 1948, p. 10.

bor's, we should be concerned enough to begin to attend to it. Since we have inherited a Christian civilization, we are indebted to that civilization. We owe nothing to the king of whirl.

It has become a truism that we cannot have a different, certainly not a better society, until we have different and better citizens to make up that society. It should be the mark of the thinking man to be able to see through passing fads, to outride the passing storms of society. It is the depths not the breadth, the peace not the tumult, that should mark the patriarch. It is no mark of the creative Christian to be overcome by all the noisy claims of science, even when applied to advertising.

A writer in *The Commonwealth* a few years since made the keen observation, "Already a generation of the unsure has grown up, a generation unaware of any absolute moral or natural law, unable to trust their untrained consciences. What is allowed by law is all right: so alcoholism, divorce, birth control are okay; euthanasia, gambling, prostitution, pederasty are wrong; but, should sufficient people commit them, then it is time the laws were changed to accommodate conditions, and once the law permits, they're all as right as rain."

It is this generation of the unsure that should concern us, for the men and women in that generation will have much to do with what our tomorrow will be. They have arrived at their precarious predicament largely as a result of a lack of any accepted moral standards, or with the idea that what the majority wants is "as right as rain." A Gallop poll, or a *Life* and *Fortune* survey, is not a reliable criterion for what is right in the realm of morals and values. But this attitude prevails despite the fact that the ones who hide behind the law are just as free to evade or violate the law whenever they can get by with it. Breaking the law is done with such freedom of conscience that it becomes the smart thing to do.

If we may accept the dictum of such sports idols as Gene Tunney and Gil Dodds, it is good sportsmanship to pray before a contest, but to pray that one may do his best. Both Tunney and Dodds say they never pray to win, but that they may do their best, that they may "follow through." This remains true for all of us, both young and old. The "generation of the unsure," those who live in the kingdom of whirl, should be mindful that Christianity is not an *ism*. It is a way of life. True enough, we have Communism, Materialism, and Humanism, but in all these God has been deposed. Christianity remains *the way*. It is in that way alone that we may detect the speech of the angel among the noise of thunder; that we may be still and hear the voice of God.

Book Reviews

Religion and the Rise of Western Culture. By CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1950. pp. xvi-286. \$3.50.

This book contains the Gifford Lectures, 1948-1949, by the scholarly Roman Catholic historian of England. Here we have the graphic portrayal of the rise and development of Western culture from the time of the barbarian invasions to the creation of the Great Society, religious and cultural, which we know as medieval Europe. We are told that the Dark Ages were not so dark as we are often led to believe. Attention is called to a series of revivals and to periods of renaissance which produced a ferment of change continually leavening the lump. In this creative process the Church was the primary factor, opposing, uniting with, or sublimating various secular trends.

The Church, obviously, did not develop and grow in an ecclesiastical groove of its own, in a religious vacuum as it were. We must therefore make an over-all study which will reveal the action and interaction of all the factors which helped to build Western culture. The author is right in his assertion that political, social, moral, and economic aspects intertwine with the religious. The Church began her tremendous task by the peaceful conquest and heroic evangelization of the barbarian tribes, thus making possible a unified society which could become the matrix of a new culture.

The Carolingian renaissance, however, receives scant recognition, presumably because its promotion centered in the secular authority of the Empire rather than in the Church. And the contrast between the two societies is overdone in the description: "the war society of the barbarian kingdom with its cult of heroism and aggression and the peace society of the Christian Church with its ideals of asceticism and renunciation and its high theological culture" (p. 17). The two were not so sharply differentiated, for we can speak of a barbarized, feudalized Church as well as of a Christianized, feudalized, barbaric society.

The author is probably right in his contention that few historians have done justice to the reforming movements, such as the Cluny reform of monasticism, the Hildebrandine freeing of the Church, and the Cistercian revitalization of society. A common cause and common moral ideals, largely the creation of the Church, made possible the succeeding Golden Age of the medieval Church. Reformers, orthodox and otherwise, often called the Church to repentance. St. Bernard, for instance, reminded pope and prelates that the Church had a stake in the character of society, "for if you are to do the work of a prophet you need the hoe rather than the sceptre" (p. 247). Some, indeed, saw no hope except in the coming of Christ who would establish a new age of the Spirit.

The author regrets the fusion of the reform movement with certain heretical groups and individuals, thus giving little credit to the "reforms" of Arnold of Brescia, Dante, or Rienzi, largely because of their hostility to Rome's dictatorial policy. This whole undercurrent of radical reform, so often heterodox, seldom receives the attention it deserves at the hands of historians of the Roman faith. One of the most potent movements, the *Devotio Moderna*, for instance, and men of the caliber of Gerard Groote (cf. *The Brethren of the Common Life*, by Professor Hyma) are completely ignored. Some mystics, the Friends of God, and especially the Friars receive the

consideration they deserve. But where the profound influence of St. Francis upon the general development of Western culture and religion is acknowledged, the tragedy of the suppression of the saint's original ideal and testament is minimized.

The world of feudal society with its chivalry and courtly culture is slightly idealized. The medieval city, the commune and the guilds, the universities and university life with their respective contributions to religion, life, and culture receive full treatment. Although the glorious ideal of a united Christendom fades to receive its coup de grâce in the sixteenth-century revolution, the author feels that the ideal still lives as an influence, giving us the hope that we again may have the "vital fusion between a living religion and a living culture" (p. 274).

Toward the close, the author presents Piers Plowman, and his splendid vision of the ascendancy of the common man, as an exponent of the fusion of religion and culture. The luminous inspiration of this poetic prophet transcended the older fundamental dualism which had made a sharp contrast between the otherworldly and the secular interests of this world. The supernatural order, instead, was held to be basic to and grounded in the common life of man.

Aside from its manifest historical value, this brilliant treatise may offer light on the problem of the present eruption of barbaric forces in a civilization that has largely lost its religious faith.

ARTHUR W. NAGLER

Garrett Biblical Institute, Northwestern University Campus, Evanston, Illinois.

The Social Crisis of Our Time. By WILHELM RÖPKE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950. pp. 260.

To a generation for which the economist has generally assumed the guise of the dialectician, the statistician, or the technician, the work of a Wilhelm Röpke comes from an unfamiliar quarter. A noted Swiss economist and teacher at the Graduate School of International Studies in Geneva, Dr. Röpke derives from the classic tradition of scholarship, in which political economy is regarded as an offspring of philosophy, with the humanities and moral philosophy as its peers and mathematical science merely its useful vassal.

From this cultural vantage point, physically planted in the mountain fastnesses of the archetypal small democracy of Switzerland, Dr. Röpke has attempted a statement and summary—written incidentally in German during the first years of the recent war—of his understanding of the nature of the disintegrative forces at work in modern society, and of the measures which men of good will must take to reinvigorate the great liberal *esprit* of Western civilization.

The touchstone of this analysis is the concept of the Golden Mean. The liberalism which alone he feels can motivate society away from the scientific barbarity of modern collectivism is neither the mercantile *laissez-faire* dogma of the early nineteenth century, nor the sociological paternalism of contemporary progressives. He envisages a society in which tradition, legitimacy, functional authority, and civic morality give form and continuity without petrifying into medievalism; in which science is employed effectively without evolving into the juggernaut of rationalistic Saint-Simonism: in which the free market arbitrates the economic life of free men, yet in itself is restrained and guided by the ethically controlled policies of a just and sufficiently powerful state, and by the counterbalance of an economically independent, numerically dominant, and morally awake yeomanry and bourgeoisie.

This vision of a "free, just, decollectivized, decentralized, and deproletarianized

society," Dr. Röpke conceives as attainable only at the price of continuous intelligent effort, experiment, and readjustment. He believes the essence of the liberal principle—not necessarily any of the various economic patterns evolved by historical capitalism, nor any of the particular formulas of democracy (which may in fact lead to a tyranny of its own kind)—can and must furnish the guidance for such action. He devotes the second half of his book to sketching the outline of such an economic and social policy. Its core he insists is the maintenance of the free market, for this offers the only possible alternative to an administered, hence a "politicalized" economy, with all its concomitants of bureaucracy, regimentation, and ultimate despotism, which no technique of democratic control can forestall. But a free market can only exist in a congenial institutional, legal, and fiscal environment, and it is the supreme and delicate task of a true liberal government to maintain such an environment.

The crux of Dr. Röpke's argument here centers about the "compatible" control and intervention which such a government may undertake in realizing this end, and to this discussion he brings his considerable erudition and good will. The lessons to be learned from the experiments of the various labor, "liberal," and New Deal governments of the past decades are drawn upon, and substantial attention is focused upon the part that monopolies, cartels, patent, and tariff laws have played in distorting—sometimes almost beyond recognition—the operation of a market economy. A section is devoted to the modes in which the liberal principle must be extended to the establishment, or re-establishment, of an actual global free-trade economy, as opposed to the calamitous "bloc" and "*Lebensraum*" systems now imposed by nationalistic policies.

To the increasing literature devoted to the exploration of a "third way" out of the present world impasse of socialist-collectivism versus fascist-reaction, this book would seem to be a valuable addition.

It is the reviewer's opinion, however, that Dr. Röpke's analysis, painstaking though it is, does not penetrate deeply enough into the factors which have always inhibited the development of a true free man's economy. The enormously important questions of the omnipresent monopolies of credit and of land—raised and masterfully discussed by men of the caliber of Proudhon and Henry George—are barely touched upon by Dr. Röpke; and it is difficult to see how any "radical" program of economic liberalism, as the author conceives his to be, can ignore such key issues.

PETER VAN DRESSER

City planning analyst and writer on scientific subjects, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

The Kingdom and the Power. By PAUL S. MINEAR. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950. pp. 269. \$4.50.

Paul Minear belongs in the front rank of New Testament scholars, and is being so recognized at home and abroad. His major interest is biblical theology, a field to which he made a basic contribution by his previous work, *Eyes of Faith*. In that volume an enthusiastic Kierkegaardian scholar rendered us from such a stance a thought-provoking challenge to rethink our own accustomed way of approaching the Bible. Naturally his position, at the neo-orthodox extreme, caused considerable controversy. Since Professor Minear occupies an important position of leadership, many have been waiting to see in what direction his next major work would tend.

This volume, lectures given at Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, answers that question. We find here a far more relaxed witness, less over against and far more for and with the Christian community as a whole. There is even some of the joy and victory of the Gospel itself, a rather rare occurrence in biblical exposition

by critical scholars. Most of the distinctive claims for the unity of the New Testament which he supported before are kept, but they are put within a fuller context and written in a different mood. Dr. Minear is drawing ever closer to the heart of the biblical message itself. What is most noticeable about this volume, then, is this dropping of defenses and the proclaiming of the healing truth of the gospel. "The offense" is now less man-made and more because of the nature of the gospel itself in its relation to sinful man.

The main thesis of the book is to the effect that the Kingdom of God offers the most adequate answer to the meaning and problems of history. Jesus Christ is the central symbol and summary of God's gracious work in creation and redemption. But he cannot be known apart from our becoming new creatures in him, with new hearts and new eyes. The mysteries of God become accessible to man through God's own revelation of himself—not that man's time is equated with God's nor that man's perspective becomes adequate to account for, or ever fully to penetrate, these mysteries, but man comes to know the God who makes him no longer a stranger in his universe, a player in the meaningless drama of history. Instead the Christian, within the story of Jesus and the participation in that story in his own life, walks life's way with saving meaning shining out of the mystery and faith's light to dispel the fear of the ultimate nature of things. There is more appreciation of nature, history, time—in short God's total work with man—in this work than ever before.

The main problem, aside from numerous minor questions, is Minear's treatment of social problems. He still makes the Christian impact on society too individualistic and internal to suit me. Certainly these aspects are of utmost importance, but is there not also more room for Christian concern with respect to all the dimensions of life? Dr. Minear's answer is obvious: "I am giving you the New Testament view, not theology." True, the New Testament does not repudiate slavery, but seems rather to sanction it as a social institution. It is transcended only in the Lord, or within the Christian community as such rather than in actual society. To this argument the answer, however, is also near at hand to the effect that we should not be bound by the time-conditioned attitudes of the Bible, but take its eternal gospel of God's love in Christ and let its implications be worked out ever more fully in every age. With such an understanding and use of it, the Bible can condemn and help us unseat social evils. To which Dr. Minear can answer, in turn, either that this is not his task as a biblical scholar, or that the indirect way is always the only means of Christian influence on society. At this point the book is bound to arouse controversy.

The volume is written in Dr. Minear's rich, direct, and graceful style. It is easy to read for those sustainably interested in the Gospel. Christian co-workers will rejoice in this important achievement and let it be strongly used.

NELS F. S. FERRÉ

Vanderbilt University School of Religion, Nashville, Tennessee.

The American as Reformer. By ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. pp. xi-127. \$2.25.

This booklet is made up of the three lectures that Professor Schlesinger, the Harvard historian, delivered at Pomona College at Claremont, California, in the Spring of 1950. The first of the three, "The Historical Climate of Reform," states the over-all proposition in brief and persuasive terms. The other two lectures, "The Reform Impulse in Action" and "The Revolt against Revolt," contain illustrative

materials picked more or less at random from the rich storehouse of American history.

Professor Schlesinger does not claim that the Americans have a monopoly on reform. He does, indeed, make it explicit that other peoples, notably the English, have also carried on struggles for human improvement, and often with success. But, he argues, for two main reasons the tempo of reform has been swifter in America than in older countries. First, Americans have not been burdened by the heavy weight of tradition. As Emerson pointed out: "America was opened after the feudal mischief was spent, and so the people made a good start. . . . No inquisition here, no kings, no nobles, no dominant church." Secondly, the immigrants to America, both the early and the later ones, were persons who had revolted against caste and class in Europe and came to the New World to build a better life. "The departure of such folk," Professor Schlesinger writes, "slowed down the impetus to change at home, just as it tended to quicken it in the adopted country."

The American reform impulse, which has had a consistent vitality, stems, according to Professor Schlesinger, from two sources. One is the Christian religion; the other, the Declaration of Independence. By Christian religion, he means Protestantism, quoting Edmund Burke's famous observation that "All Protestantism, even the most cold and passive, is a sort of dissent" and that the colonists who settled America represented "the Protestantism of the Protestant religion." As for the Declaration of Independence, it has been the fountainhead of American idealism from the day the Republic was founded. It has given generations of Americans spiritual meaning and direction. It has also served as a corrective to public error and a warning against political abuse, for as Woodrow Wilson said, the Declaration of Independence "is not a thesis for philosophers, but a whip for tyrants."

Unhindered by tradition and inspired by their religious heritage and political idealism, Americans have pioneered in a whole series of reforms vital both for democratic polity and human happiness. Among the great reforms of which Americans have been the pace-setters, one may mention the separation of church and state (considered by the Founding Fathers, notably Jefferson and Madison, as indispensable to democracy), extension of the suffrage, free public education, a liberal public-land policy, "trust busting," and prison reform. At every stage, reforms met with opposition from the conservatives who, in the end, absorbed them and helped to make them part of the "American" system.

Reform may thus be said to be the essence of Americanism, despite the shrill claims of certain superpatrioters who, in truth, have always been with us. Professor Schlesinger writes:

"Probably no terms, however, have ever been more badly mauled through the years than 'American' and 'Americanism.' To the historian these words denote the abiding effort to realize the goal of Jefferson's great Preamble and the social teachings of Christianity, but too frequently they have been stolen by bigoted enemies of these principles."

The American as Reformer, in sum, is a stimulating booklet by a liberal-minded historian and deserves to be read widely, especially by those whose faith in American idealism needs strengthening. In addition, the small work contains excellent quotations, and the twenty pages of bibliographic notes are almost worth the price of the book.

SAUL K. PADOVER

Dean, School of Politics, New School for Social Research, New York City.

Early American Methodism, 1769-1844. (History of Methodist Missions.)

Volume Two: To Reform the Nation. By WADE CRAWFORD BARCLAY.

New York: The Board of Missions and Church Extension of The Methodist Church, 1950. pp. xi-562. \$3.50.

Dr. Wade Crawford Barclay is rendering The Methodist Church a significant service in the preparation of his six-volume study on the History of Methodist Missions. Here in complete story is the fascinating and factual portrayal of the motivation and expansion of missions within American Methodism. If it is true that a book is the heart of a man in another man's hands, then surely the great heart of Dr. Barclay is revealed in the work he has prepared and produced with skill and simplicity.

It is not only the individual and the church that stand in need of the reforming power of God but likewise the nation, and Methodists have ever declared this to be so. The first chapter of this second volume deals with such burning social issues as temperance, slavery, interracial tensions, and labor. The program of social action in our great church, expressed in the Social Creed, is here originated. The church not only acts but is itself an action, and Methodists have never sought to evade the ethical implications in social issues. By no other way could they hope to reform the nation.

Chapters II and III bring to us, for the first time, the complete and authentic saga of the Indian missions east and west of the Mississippi. This record has been compiled with great effort and research, and should be in the possession of every Methodist preacher.

For many readers, Chapter IV, entitled "The Methodist Way," will stand as the crowning achievement of the book. We are still a people of the "Way." True to the heritage of first-century Christianity, we have not allowed doctrine or polity to take precedence over a useful Christian life. Four delineations of the Methodist Way are made by the author.

The Methodist Way is a way of experience. The power of the itinerant preacher lay in his assurance of the witness of the Spirit. He possessed an immediate sense of God, and by reason of this sense and experience, he brought forth fruit. While it was not all good, the fact remains that, through this power, many mediocre men became great men who worked on a Great Design and dared to challenge the absurdity of the world. Hope and aspiration marked their ministry.

The Methodist Way is a way of fellowship. The Class, the Society, the Band, the Quarterly Meetings, and later the Annual Conferences were social groups providing a constructive fellowship. It is pointed out that this very fellowship served to bind together diverse strands in the American culture of that day, thus rendering a significant service to the community. These social groups antedated all political groups in our nation. Nor were any seekers excluded on the basis of birth or economic impoverishment. Francis Asbury's word to his preachers that "we must suffer with if we labor for the poor" is still good Methodist doctrine.

The Methodist Way is a way of discipline. Through discipline, the early Methodists found a new dynamic for living. Because of the severity of such disciplines as were imposed, it is quite possible that many fine men were lost to Methodism. They simply couldn't take it, but those who could and did were giants because of it. In 1808, the New England Conference voted all Fridays days of fasting or abstinence. The passing of the character of the members of the Annual Conference was serious business, often leading to church trials. Celibacy, if not required, was expected for the first four years in the itinerancy. The inner core of the ministry was kept strong and pure by such self-imposed disciplines.

The Methodist Way was an organized way. We early learned what many denominations have yet to learn—"the supporting power of organization." Through organization fired by the genius of Wesley, the holiness cult became a crusade.

The next chapter, "The Methodist Message," deals with the distinctive doctrines of early Methodism. It is good to recall the dictum of Martin Luther that the pulpit is higher than the altar and that it is only through the preached Word that the sacraments derive significance. The itinerant preached the Word as he understood it. This led to some doctrinal controversy, but it was the drive for decision that marked his message. It was such preaching as led to the establishment of schools and colleges and to an enriched type of instruction and worship. The doctrine was never allowed to stand in the way of the life to be won.

This volume concludes with a chapter, "Men with a Mission." Not all the early preachers were assets. Many were inferior men, but even these find places in the endless line of splendor of heroic and devout men who transformed a nation Godward. We wonder if we are worthy to stand in such a succession. To read this volume is to understand why we have been called the "typical American church." All who read the first two volumes of this great study will await with eagerness and expectancy the succeeding books. Christian stewardship demands wide and sound reading, even as it requires generous and cheerful giving.

JOHN WESLEY LORD

Bishop of The Methodist Church, Boston, Massachusetts.

John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland. Two Volumes; edited by WILLIAM CROFT DICKINSON. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1950. pp. cix-374, v-498. \$15.00.

John Knox in Controversy. By HUGH WATTS. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1950. pp. ix-109. \$2.75.

Although John Knox did not live to see in print *The History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland*, that work has now passed through many editions, both popular and scholarly. This most recent of them all has been enterprised in the hope that the reading of the best-told first-hand account of the rise of present-day church and state in Scotland may contribute to the preservation of that historic land and people.

Knox was active during the late years of Henry VIII, Edward, Mary, and half of the reign of Elizabeth. It was the time during which medieval, feudal, Catholic England and Scotland were becoming the most influential modern, industrial, democratic, Protestant forces in the world. So that the Reformation was operative not only in church but in state. The "divine right of kings" was being confronted by the "divine right of the individual," and man's saving faith was receiving the attention formerly held by priesthood and sacrament.

When interpreted from the standpoint of the twentieth century it is not so much that the church of that day was helpless or corrupt, but that there was arising in that land a quality of person which could no longer be served so well by agencies more useful in an earlier society. Contemporary and impressive documents are offered to show that the people were hungry for *preaching*. Their inquiring minds were seeking an understanding of God in religion, and at the same time of justice in the state. "Let the true religion be preached and observed, and the true politics would perforce follow." Because under Catholic and kingly reign officers in the church had come

to be chosen by state rulers, piety had ceased to be a primary qualification for the ministry, and edification was rarely considered by priests as their major function. Under the peculiar circumstances of this reformation period, French influence over Scotland in state and Roman Catholic control in religion combined against the rising Protestant individualism and the more largely effective political democracy.

To John Knox these were not systems just to be compared and contrasted; they had to do directly with human welfare and with the everlasting salvation of souls. His history therefore became one of propaganda as well as narrative. And when one remembers that the temper of the time was that of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day rather than that of our modern toleration, one ceases to condemn the vigor of Knox's analysis and account. Roman Catholicism was to him nothing less than idolatry, and the political reign either of a Frenchman or a papist to be fought as with fire. Truth was being attacked; truth he would defend!

Those who have right to declare tell us that Knox was impartial in his selection of materials and accurate in interpretation of events. Almost half of the second volume of this work is given over to "original sources" of the period; and these documents testify to the justice of the reformer's conclusions.

John Knox in Controversy, by Hugh Watt, until recently Principal of New College, Edinburgh University, is a series of lectures delivered in 1949 before the Princeton Theological Seminary. The two works together constitute a fascinating presentation of a most important phase of the development of Protestant understanding and democratic political control.

ROBERT W. GOODLOE

Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

Dream and Reality. By NICOLAS BERDYAEV. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. pp. xv-332. \$4.50.

This "Essay in Autobiography" is indispensable for any serious study of Berdyaev, for it was the lack of just such adequate biographical information which had been the chief difficulty in the study of his thought. But even in this autobiographical "essay" Berdyaev's reticence in matters of his life story is discernible; for what he aims at is the portrayal of his philosophical and spiritual development rather than the story of his external circumstances and experiences. (The Russian title of the book is more revealing of this primary purpose than the title chosen for the translation; for it bears the designation, *Self-knowledge. An Essay in Philosophical Autobiography*.)

The spiritual Odyssey which Berdyaev portrays is honest and sincere. His self-revelation will afford those who wish to whip him ample opportunity to do so. Born an aristocrat, but brought up in revolt against his own social milieu, he could never brook any interference with his spiritual freedom. His emphasis on "spiritual aristocracy" can be easily perverted into an indication of pride and haughtiness. The strong Platonic strain in him which showed itself in his almost pathological distaste for the merely physical, so that he confessed himself a stranger to the dominant culture of the age, can be easily taken to indicate petulance and contrariety. For as he himself confessed, he was truly a "captive of freedom." No wonder that he made spiritual freedom (there is no other) the central concept of his whole religious philosophy.

Among the most valuable features of this remarkable essay in ruthless self-revelation is Berdyaev's story of his religious quest. He is widely regarded among Westerners as a representative of Russian Orthodoxy. Even one of the Russian religious intellectuals wrote recently that "Berdyaev's spiritual home was Russian Ortho-

doxy." But Berdyaev is not responsible for this uncritical judgment: he writes in the strongest and plainest terms how much embarrassment such mistaken opinions have caused him. To be sure, he drew much of his inspiration from the great mystics of Eastern Orthodoxy, including such Russian thinkers as Dostoevsky, Soloviev, and others. But his thought was likewise steeped in Western philosophical and religious movements—both positively and negatively—and he was particularly influenced by Boehme and Kant. One is, therefore, dealing in Berdyaev with a Russian religious thinker *sui generis*, whose thought is deeply affected by, yet critical of, the Eastern Orthodox tradition in general and the Russian Church in particular. And yet he preferred Eastern Orthodoxy to any of the Western confessions, because the former, whose dogmatic system was less rigidly defined, was more congenial to his free interpretations of the basic Christian insights.

Although it is true that Berdyaev's style was prolix and repetitious, this does not justify his translator in arbitrarily paraphrasing his text, particularly when the reader of the translation is given no hint of this practice. The present book is a rank example of such a practice. The translator's rendering is of the loosest, often inaccurate, kind. Whole paragraphs, not to say anything about individual sentences, are omitted without the slightest indication of the fact, and the rest is almost invariably paraphrased instead of translated. Many statements of Berdyaev are thus either obscured or actually changed in their meaning. On the other hand, the translator inserts editorial remarks without any indication that they are hers rather than the author's. I have rarely met with such a flagrant indulgence in this practice, and feel that it should not be allowed to pass without a vigorous protest.

MATTHEW SPINKA

The Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut.

A Life of Jesus. By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. pp. 248. \$3.00.

It is significant that Edgar J. Goodspeed should write a life of Jesus after his many studies in the field of New Testament backgrounds. In doing this it is as though he were saying that it is the story itself which is central, the story which produced the New Testament. It is interesting, also, that he should call his book a "Life of Jesus," in the face of the prevailing temper in some quarters of biblical study to regard the Gospels as the creation of the piety of the early church, and as such helpful in learning what it was that the first Christians believed but of little value in determining a picture of the historical Jesus.

While recognizing that the story came to us through the medium of the church, Dr. Goodspeed proceeds on the assumption that basically it is reliable as a source for determining a true portrait of Jesus. He is impatient with the type of scholarship which would aprioristically rule out as unhistorical all events in Jesus' life which are similar to Old Testament prophecies. On the contrary he regards this concern for the Old Testament as true of Jesus himself, pointing out that Jesus chose deliberately an ass on which to ride into Jerusalem because of the prophecy of Zechariah.

A date toward the end of the reign of Herod the Great (died 4 B.C.) is accepted for the birth of Jesus. The virgin birth stories represent a translation of the idea of divine sonship into narrative form, according to the Greek tendency to cast dogma into story. Any attempt to fill in the "hidden years" by the use of historical imagination is distrusted, and there is no inclination to do so in this book, except to indicate a possible association between Jesus and John the Baptist as young men. There is no reason seen

for ruling out Bethlehem as the place of Jesus' birth, at least not on the basis that Matthew finds an Old Testament reference suggesting that the Messiah was to be born there (Matt. 2:5, 6).

The basic issue in the writing of any life of Jesus is whether or not Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah, together with his view of the nature of the Kingdom of God. Regarding the former, Dr. Goodspeed believes that Jesus did consider himself as the Messiah, not in the traditionally political sense, but along the lines of the Servant passages of Isaiah, especially Isa. 61:1ff. His conception of his mission was essentially and desperately religious. This sense of vocation came to him at his baptism, was sharpened during the period known as the temptations, and was heightened and defined further at the time of the Transfiguration. There is a positive note in Dr. Goodspeed's conclusion that Jesus went to Jerusalem not as one accepting passively an inevitable and tragic fate, but in order boldly to confront the religious leaders of the nation, "and he would do this in ways that would make his death something that would never be forgotten, but would carry on his message to the end of time." (p. 130)

Jesus' conception of the Kingdom is to be regarded as religious also. Dr. Goodspeed believes that to some extent Jesus was an apocalypticist. This was true in the sense that he believed God would rebuke human wickedness by the overwhelming recognition of his power in the judgment and reformation of mankind (p. 126). Better than the method of apocalypse, however, Jesus believed that he should win men's hearts to God here and now. Toward the end of his ministry Jesus saw a foreshortening of mankind's future. He knew that the present course of events followed by both Jews and Romans would lead to catastrophe. This conviction formed the heart of Mark 13, although the apocalyptic sections in all three Gospels owe many of their details to events during the forty years following the death of Jesus. In his apocalyptic phraseology, Jesus was not the literalist which the prosaic Western mind has made him out to be.

This book was written out of the overflow of the years. Its conclusions are traditional only because they are similar to what many others have found. The negative historical judgments of some form-criticism scholars are missing. Quotations from other writers in the field are few, and detailed discussions of contrary points of view infrequent. Some would feel that there was a too easy acceptance of Papias' statement concerning the origin of Mark, at least that there was an insufficient recognition of the form-process behind it. From the book there emerges a portrait of Jesus that is religiously vibrant and historically convincing.

CHARLES M. LAYMON

Indianola Methodist Church, Columbus 1, Ohio.

The Man Jesus Was. By MAX SCHOEN. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950. pp. 224. \$3.00.

This is a hard book even to describe, and a still harder book to judge, because the author is a hard man to get along with. Unmistakably he has reverence for his subject, and wishes to witness to Jesus. This stirs my tender feelings, moves me to embrace the author as a "brother in Christ." But Max Schoen is a burred individualist, full of unresolved conflicts, and plainly does not want to get mixed up with other witnesses to Jesus.

Schoen starts out as if his intention were to find the "real historical Jesus." The title of his book suggests it, the blurb on the jacket practically promises it, and several statements in the early pages seem to be getting ready for that pursuit. It is a pursuit

that goes back two centuries, which Albert Schweitzer surveyed in his *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, and which "modern" scholars have abandoned as a vain hope and a naively conceived notion. But that problem need not give us pause, for the author does not follow through.

More than half the book is devoted to describing Jewish background. In two of these chapters, "The World Drama of Redemption" and "The Holy Congregation of Israel," Schoen succeeds nobly in suggesting the inward feeling and understanding of a pious Jew toward his heritage. This is done quite uncritically, however, and what we get, it seems to this reviewer, is a picture of how a pious Jew of more recent times feels and thinks about his heritage. Schoen gives no recognition of the great, centrally important inner tension in the history and faith of Israel (as reflected in the Old Testament) between the prophetic and the priestly. He can make such an altogether unacceptable statement as: "The scribes, as custodians and interpreters of the Written Torah, were in truth the successors of the prophets of old" (p. 108). Later, Schoen remarks that what Jesus "taught about the religious way of life the prophets would have objected to as much as the Pharisees" (p. 177). This is blindness to the fact that the spirit of the prophets and the spirit of the Pharisees were almost totally different.

When Schoen has finished presenting his background material and is ready to take up Jesus, he can use it only to show how the teaching and spirit of Jesus contrasted with it, and why Jesus would naturally be rejected as an upsetter of the sacred applecart. This, of course, is a valid and useful thing to do. It helps clarify the teaching of Jesus and explain his crucifixion. But it does not show that there was a strand in the heritage of Israel (represented by such men as Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah) that undoubtedly fed and tutored Jesus, helped prepare him for his startling originality. Nor does Schoen take note of the highly significant fact that Jesus accepted baptism from the hands of John the Baptizer, who was a reincarnation of the old prophetic spirit.

Instead of a portrait of Jesus we have a brief summary of his teaching (which I consider to be well done within the scope adopted), coupled with a testimony to him as a timeless genius in whose "spirit and teaching lies the only remedy for the numerous afflictions of the present social order." After considerable quibbling, Schoen is ready to call Jesus "the Messiah, the Redeemer, of every person in whom there stirs the germ of the God of love."

The book therefore boils down to what might be called an appreciation of Jesus, and the pertinent question is, Does it add or contribute to such appreciation? My answer is, perhaps so—but with distressing flaws. One trouble is that in testifying to the pre-eminence, not to say Messiahship, of Jesus he throws brickbats at all the other disciples, giving the impression that he alone is left to speak the truth. He completely repudiates Judaism, and his condemnation of Christianity is both bitter and blanket: "The new religion became as legalistic, exclusive, and conditional as the old" (p. 215). "Among them the religions have brought about a kingdom on earth over which God's adversary reigns supreme" (p. 218).

Schoen is unable to handle the paradox of Jesus as a Jew and as a transcender of Jewry. He gets fighting mad on both sides of the fence and can find no reconciliation between those two facets of the truth. He emphasizes that Jesus was a genius who belongs to no place and time, and touches all men at the very source of their manhood (p. 221), but he will accept no non-Jewish presentation of Jesus in the New Testament as valid. It was a sacrilege for the author of the Fourth Gospel and

for the apostle Paul to present Jesus to the Gentile world in terms that the Gentiles might comprehend. While he rejects the concept of Jesus held by the "liberal elements" as entirely inadequate, he joins those elements in castigating Paul as the great corrupter. "When Paul transformed the Jesus of history into the Christ of faith he sowed the seed which developed the crop of a new Pharisaism in the form of Christian theology" (p. 215). Schoen gives no evidence of recognizing that anything but evil has ever been done, from Paul on, in the name of Christ.

HUGH STEVENSON TIGNER
Plainville, New York.

Jesus in the Jewish Tradition. By MORRIS GOLDSTEIN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. pp. ix-319. \$4.00.

This book answers the question, "What has been the attitude of Judaism to Jesus?" Through a continuous historic account it demonstrates that Jewish attitudes toward Jesus have tended to reflect Christian attitudes toward Jews: respectful in the early days, deteriorating under persecution, and contemptuous in eras of massacre. The author distributes the traditions into chronological strata and thus supplies means for evaluating their trustworthiness.

Portions that will interest the average reader are the five "authentic references to Jesus" from the first and second centuries. Of dubious significance is the one concerning the five disciples of Yeshu. In another there is a charge of heresy implicit in the pun on *evangelion* that likens it to the "falsehood" or "sin" interpolated upon the "blank margins" of manuscripts by stupid scribes. Healing in the name of "Yeshu ben Pantera" is important for the strong impression that the curative powers of Jesus made upon his generation. In this passage a reference to him as son of Pantera lent itself to the slur popular in a later age, to which Goldstein gives considerable space, that Jesus was born out of lawful wedlock, his father being a Roman soldier. Goldstein suggests that Pantera was an ancestor of Jesus, basing his argument on Church Fathers like John of Damascus. It seems more likely that Pantera was the Greek name of Joseph, an interpretation that supplements other evidence pointing to the social origins of Jesus being less humble than has been commonly assumed, and strengthening the argument I have advanced elsewhere for his having been reared in a more important locality than Nazareth.

The remaining two passages discussed by Goldstein attest the Jewishness of Jesus. In one of them he cites Yeshu's quip on "the hire of a harlot," which got the great Eliezer ben Hyrcanus involved in an indictment for heresy, as evidence for the ability of Jesus to employ rabbinic argument; in this instance commending himself to one of the founders of rabbinic Judaism. This passage is important also for the Master's sense of humor; and, as I have pointed out in *Render to God* (pp. 96f), for his hatred of the highpriesthood.

The other passage is: "On the eve of Passover they hanged Yeshu. And an announcer went out, in front of him, for forty days . . . But, not having found anything in his favor, they hanged him on the eve of Passover." This old "tradition," Goldstein reminds us, supports John's Gospel against the Synoptics for the day of the crucifixion. He interprets it as evidence for orderly rabbinic procedure at the trial of Jesus; but at this point his exposition seems astonishing, especially as he himself has stressed the political nature of his offense, which did not come within the purview of Jewish law. Some fifty years ago Adolf Büchler demonstrated that the Sadducean

assembly established by Rome was an institution foreign to that of the king-hating Pharisees. Research upon the emperor cult and provincial administration of the *lex maiestatis* confirms the quisling status of Jesus' antagonists.

That orthodox Pharisaism in sober mood perceived that the "enticement" of Israel by Jesus concerned politics rather than religion, seems implicit in the later commentary on this "tradition." Rabbi Ulla (A.D. 400) said, "Would you suppose that he was eligible for defense? was he not an enticer? . . . But it was different with Yeshu, for he was near to the government." Goldstein's theory that the passage shows the friendly interest of Herod Antipas (pp. 110f) seems a counsel of despair. When taken in the sense of Mishnah *Aboth* 1.10, the words "near to government" point to political action; even as late as Rabbi Ulla there were Jews who sensed the tragedy of the Cross—"It was different with Yeshu. His was not the sort of 'enticement' that merited death."

Space does not permit comment on much else significant for Christian origins. The volume is definitive, and will displace that of Herford. It should remain for many years the primary book in this field. In spite of its weighty scholarship its subject matter is well within the capacity of the ordinary layman. Unfortunately the literature analysis and arrangement of the notes are confusing.

J. SPENCER KENNARD, JR., PH.D.

434 West 120th Street, New York City.

Render to God: A Study of the Tribute Passage. By J. SPENCER KENNARD, JR. New York: The Oxford University Press, 1950. pp. x-148. \$3.00.

This essay is both convincing and provocative: convincing by the accumulation of factual evidence, presented in a form manageable by the layman (e.g., the chapter on the denarius), provocative in some of the interpretations of Jesus (e.g., of his Messianic consciousness as key to his attitude toward the tribute).

Briefly stated, Dr. Kennard's argument is that Jesus' answer is far from being a clever evasion or, as the traditional theory has it, an endorsement of submission to Caesar (which involves a dualism impossible for Jesus and an equally impossible task for the follower, of untangling what belongs to Caesar from what belongs to God). In the first half of his statement, Jesus challenges the tax-exempt quisling ruling class to "drink their own poison" and "return" to Caesar the coin marked in his image, which belongs to him, with its blasphemous claim to Lordship. In the second half, Jesus reasserts a basic principle of Judaism: God's ownership of all property, including taxes. "The pious Jew was obligated not only to handle God's property with discretion, but also to safeguard it from seizure by God's enemies" (p. 124). The unrighteous uses to which the tribute was put (support of the Roman legions, of Caesar's court, of the ruler cult) made nonpayment a *religious* responsibility. Both parts of the saying are therefore concerned with the tribute, but also both parts are concerned with religion.

There is here a message pertinent for our times—a quotation from Mahatma Gandhi shows that he was aware of this. The confusion of thought which allows us to see Jesus excluding taxes from what belongs to God stems from a deep-seated ethical confusion. This little book calls for a renewed sense of "the sacredness of civic obligations" and points up our responsibility for what the State does with our taxes in the year of Our Lord 1951.

If Dr. Kennard is less stimulating where he argues for the interrelatedness of

tribute and Messiahship, this does not detract from the value of the main point he makes, that Jesus encouraged nonpayment *because* payment was a duty to God.

The book is embellished with some fine photographs of coins and there are careful bibliographical references.

DORA WILLSON

Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pennsylvania.

From Constantine to Julian: A History of the Early Church, Volume III.

By HANS LIETZMANN. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1950. pp. 340. \$5.50.

The lamented death in 1942 of Professor Hans Lietzmann, Harnack's brilliant successor at the University of Berlin, found the fourth volume of his projected five-volume *Geschichte der Alten Kirche* near enough completion to be published in 1944. The first three volumes are available in English and the fourth is now in process of being translated.

The translated third volume here under review illustrates Lietzmann's justly acclaimed gifts as a church historian. His thorough mastery of the sources, both secular and ecclesiastical; his specialist's ability in each of the major areas of church life; his perception of the subtle interrelations among these areas and between them and secular forces; his daring but well founded and gracefully presented generalizations, all come to view in this volume. In setting forth his carefully considered conclusions he seldom presents in detail the controversial steps by which some of them were reached. He has built carefully, as the ample footnotes attest, but has not left scaffolding to mar architectural beauty.

The translation is in idiomatic and very readable English, but is far from literal and is often careless. "Abraham" at the oak of Mamre becomes "Moses" (p. 147), while "Schwester" slips in as "daughter" (p. 73), making Licinius son-in-law instead of brother-in-law to Constantine. Elsewhere the relationship is correctly stated (pp. 77, 79, and 80). A page of "Corrigenda et emendanda" is very far from complete.

The first chapter, with admirable condensation, sketches the political and cultural background—the salvaging of the empire by Aurelian and its reorganization by Diocletian, the Neoplatonism of Plotinus and Porphyry, Gnosticism, the Hermetic writings, and the magical papyri. There follows a chapter on the closing period of persecution when "the heroism of the few won the victory" in spite of the defection of the many.

Lietzmann's interpretation of key personalities is striking. Eusebius of Caesarea is presented as a highly trustworthy church historian. Quite consistently with this, Emperor Constantine receives extremely favorable evaluation. His conversion is regarded as thoroughly sincere, the culmination of Christian impressions starting even in boyhood. Lactantius' famous account of Constantine's conversion is declared "not impossible," and Constantine is portrayed as continually led by a sense of Christian mission, in spite of the ambiguous testimony of contemporary coinage, which is here reviewed. Contrary to traditional views, Lietzmann suggests that Constantine was not over sixty years of age at his death. His son Constantius is portrayed as a conscientious and upright man of mediocre ability.

If Eusebius and Constantine have grown as compared with conventional conceptions, Athanasius has shrunk. No detached Olympian, but a "notorious agitator," always up to the hilt in church politics, he is nonetheless declared to be "a strong religious personality . . . the most eminent man of the post-Constantine period."

His theology is treated as primarily a theology of redemption, directly foreshadowing Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*.

The Council of Nicea and the first half century and more of the Arian controversy are treated as predominantly political and ecclesiastical—a struggle between East and West and between rival sees, especially Alexandria and Antioch, with Rome in close relations with Alexandria. Thus we are told that the term “consubstantial”—*homoousios*—was adopted at Nicea solely on the insistence of Constantine and did not become a real theological issue until much later. The entire story is told without even using the familiar term “semi-Arian.” It was only decades after the Council of Nicea that the distinctive convictions attributed to the men of Nicea were really held and affirmed by theologians, says Lietzmann. This reinterpretation does help to make intelligible what in more conventional treatments appears as a sudden and unaccountable lapse from Nicene orthodoxy even before Constantine's death and as a subsequent return to it. Consistently with this reconstruction of the story, Eusebius of Nicomedia no longer appears in his familiar role of scheming, leering villain.

A brief sketch of Julian's reign is followed by a very illuminating closing chapter on the history of Christian worship during the period. This volume throughout bears the marks of the master craftsman's hand.

LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER

Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

Inquisitio de Fide: A Colloquy by Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, 1524.

Edited with Commentary by CRAIG R. THOMPSON. Yale Studies in Religion, Number XV: Yale University Press, 1950. pp. vi-131. \$3.00.

When great men meet on great issues they provide material which inevitably becomes significant. Few will dispute the claim to eminence made for both Erasmus and Luther, and this study of *Inquisitio de Fide* serves very well as a springboard from which to jump into deep water.

The piece itself is almost trivial and is neither good letters nor profound theology, as the editor readily grants, but becomes worthy of attention only on account of the context of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Like all Gaul this new edition is divided into three distinct but unequal parts, for the actual text of the Inquiry only occupies ten pages, but fore and aft it is accompanied by much annotated learning after the best manner of such enterprises. No literary stone seems to have been left unturned to estimate the importance of the verdict which Erasmus here announces to the effect that, judged by the *Symbolum Apostolorum*, Luther was passably orthodox in the Faith.

This apparent gesture of conciliation is not as simple as it seems, however, for if Erasmus offered one hand in salute he showed some ambidextrous dexterity by the fact that he was using the other hand to punch Luther on a sensitive spot. To all appearances he was writing *De Libero Arbitrio*, which attempted a hard-hitting rebuttal of Luther's theological determinism, while at the task of demonstrating his theological rectitude in *Inquisitio de Fide*. This curious affair and other similar issues become alive again in the discussion of Dr. Thompson. Luther did not have much time for Erasmus, and certainly did not reciprocate any moves toward conciliation. “A foe to all religion and a thorough sham,” was a typical comment on the humanist. “*Verbum non res*” gave him credit as a grammarian and literary critic of the Papacy, while at the same time it sufficiently indicated the Saxon Reformer's repugnance against all mere paper lances in the ecclesiastical battle.

That neither participant fully appreciated the other is a commonplace of comment, and the ground for it is well enough stated in an observation of F. W. Farrar that "the natures of Luther and Erasmus were antipathetic." The whole matter can be regarded as an episode in the stock discussion in every age between the claims of revelation and reason, and can be most usefully handled by the study of such historical material as is presented in this volume. In this way the discussion can be conducted with a minimum of the dust and heat which public castigation of living representatives sometimes creates.

Hence the admirable research of Dr. Thompson can be evaluated on two counts, first as an academic exercise in the editing of a Reformation text and, second, as a contribution to a perennial problem. On both counts the work is most excellently done, and this edition of *Inquisitio de Fide* will be standard for students. The Preface indicates that the volume is to be regarded as a first installment of a complete edition of the Colloquies and it is to be hoped that the ambitious task will be achieved. The present volume is furnished with a comprehensive index and the Latin text is accompanied by an English translation.

ROBERT B. HANNEN

Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, Berkeley, California.

Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital. By LUKE EBERSOLE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. pp. x-195. \$2.75.

Dr. Ebersole, who teaches sociology at the University of Maryland, presents the results of the first serious inquiry into the activities of the Washington offices of church agencies, and of certain others in which church people have an interest.

He interprets current programs of a large group of offices, after giving brief material on church lobbies of the past. He takes a broad view of lobbying, even describing fairly the work of several offices which are instructed not to lobby but which have constituencies that influence legislation in one way or another.

Here are data on the representative Roman Catholic and Protestant agencies, the social action agencies of a group of Protestant denominations, the historic peace churches, the Church of Christ, Scientist, Protestants and Others United for the Separation of Church and State, and many others. Church offices spoke as one voice on displaced persons, for example, and came close to harmony on such issues as European recovery, health, and housing. The churches raised their voices against one another on compulsory military training, military aid to Greece and Turkey, and the North Atlantic Treaty. "The lobbying efforts of the churches are not exclusively humanitarian nor in promotion of the general welfare." They were united in opposing increases in postal rates on religious periodicals. Lobbying in defense of churches is, according to Dr. Ebersole, a "significant although minor phase" of church lobbying.

Church offices in Washington are mainly the creation of World War II and its aftermath. Protestants felt Catholics had been more active, and Protestants became busy. Church officials found that a growing government in a complex world did not give them the information they needed when they needed it. Therefore steps were taken to secure information—and usually propaganda and advice in the bargain. The social action agencies are freely persuading their constituencies to take specific action in Washington. The war years also brought new money to churches, and some was invested in new Washington offices.

These agencies, however, make various interpretations of their functions and

authorities, and the results are not always as intended. Church lobbyists can build up movements against themselves, as well as aid the various causes to which they are devoted. This is an aspect often overlooked by promoters of church lobbies. Also, Dr. Ebersole concludes with the "untested hypothesis" that church lobbyists only "promote the causes in which groups of church leaders are interested rather than the views of church members in general."

BENSON Y. LANDIS

Associate Director, Department of Research and Survey, National Council of Churches, New York City.

All Things Common. By CLAIRE HUCHET BISHOP. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. pp. xi-274. \$3.00.

Mrs. Bishop introduces her readers to the communitarian movement in Europe, a movement which in the ten years since the defeat of France has grown from one group in Valence, France, to more than sixty communities across the Continent. The history of attempts to form a type of small community life is long and lively, especially in France; but this latest effort is especially interesting in its growth out of needs engendered by the war and in its attempt to make use of every modern technical skill in the work by which the communities support themselves. The communitarians want a better life here and now; they do not wish to withdraw or regress.

The author opens her book with the statement, "I saw free men." Although her main purpose is only to describe the communitarians and to let the reader draw his own conclusions, she was so thoroughly impressed with the openness and freedom implicit in their bearing, words, and actions that she cannot help but launch her description with these words.

"Communitarian? I had never heard the word. Communal, communist, yes. . . . The person [who first showed me around the community of Boimondau] explained that I should not link the word to the American word 'community' . . . nor to the French word 'commune' . . . nor to 'communism', for that matter, unless I was one of those people who have in recent years developed a phobia for all words stemming from the Latin root *communis*."

"Community" in most cases does not mean common living quarters nor a common purse. (A few communities have developed in this direction and are called "integral communities.") Private ownership of the individual's necessities for the fulfillment of his personal life has mostly not been questioned. The community usually owns the means of production and reimburses its workers according to a self-originated and self-accepted plan. This community ownership is usually full or partial according to circumstances and is periodically re-evaluated. Only sufficient goods or services are produced to support the members according to the standards they define, and spare time gained by increased application and efficiency is spent in study in many fields. The means of self-support are as varied as factories, farms or groups of farms, schools, or the "*Compagnons de la Musique*" who recently performed in this country with Edith Piaf. Common ownership is not an end in itself. The primary hope is "to build communities which will make possible man's development, and still not to be satisfied with what we have done."

Abbé Poutrain, prime mover in the Boisalpes Community of Work, told the author, "Spiritual progress does not take place apart from economic progress. Religious concern cannot be imposed upon people nor added on. It grows out of an

atmosphere, a climate, not out of discussions of doctrine. Our work is nonconfessional and with no political intent. The value of a work of love lies in itself." These communities number among their members Catholics, Protestants, Jews, atheists, humanists, materialists, anyone who wants to subscribe to and work for the common goal. All group decisions in all the communities are reached only through achieved unanimity of opinion. Communitarians, like Quakers, vouch for the value and effectiveness of this method.

The communities of work in Europe arose out of bitter wartime and postwar suffering. This is continually obvious in the stories of the growth of individual communities. Man after man urgently wanted to "create a manner of living in which he [had] the maximum possibility of being free." In her valuable chapter, "Objections—Communitarian Answers," Mrs. Bishop discusses the likelihood of such a movement in America. "As for being interested in the communitarian movement, it does not come from trying to put theory into practice, or copying other experiments. It comes from necessity. From suffering. As it did in Europe. When our present American way of life becomes insufferable to us, then we will again take to the open road of the pioneers."

Except for an "ethical common minimum" accepted by all the communities, an ethic based on the Decalogue except for the First Commandment (which, it is said "bears on man's destiny and not on ethics"), the Rule varies to suit each unique community. Sometimes written, sometimes oral, it is constantly reconsidered and re-evaluated. It was found that without a stated common ethical basis there was no point from which the members could start together, no possibility of building anything. The basic principles emerge forcibly and with great variety of application as the stories are told. The environment in which this latest pioneering effort to find a life suitable for man takes place—war and its attendant evils, capitalism and communism—is an obstacle, but also an incentive. As the wife of a manager who was moved gradually to turn his enterprise into a community of work declared, "Before, it was all very easy and peaceful and dead. Now it is very difficult and alive."

JOHN FORBES

Blackburn College, Carlinville, Illinois.

Methodist Worship in Relation to Free Church Worship. By JOHN BISHOP. London: The Epworth Press, 1950. pp. vi-164. 8/6.

No one concerned with the realization of the fullest possibilities of worship in Protestant churches will fail to find this little volume of 150 pages rewarding. In spite of the primacy given to Methodist worship in the title, the first half of the book is a discussion of the practice of public worship in all Free Churches, particularly in England. And even the second half of the volume devoted to "The Methodist Church—a detailed survey of its worship" has much in it that is relevant to all others in the Free Church tradition.

The Introduction and Epilogue have one theme, which is also the main emphasis of the book: the need for Protestant churches to preserve and blend the Catholic tradition with its corporate and objective worship, and the Evangelical tradition with its more personal and subjective emphasis. In Part I, after observing that one of the main dangers in Protestant worship is that services may consist of unrelated items, the author discusses the elements of Praise, Prayer, Scripture, Sermon, and Sacra-

ments, and how all these may be brought into a psychologically sound structure and movement.

"The music of worship is part of the people's offering to God and should, therefore, represent the best that they can give." Because prayers from the traditional liturgy of the church can help to educate the worshiper in the historical basis of his faith, to bind him into the larger fellowship of the church, give him an opportunity to participate audibly, and free him from the idiosyncracies of the individual minister, they should be used generously—but not exclusively. There is equal need of extempore prayer, not in the sense of being unprepared, but of being contemporary and relevant. Quoting from William Arthur, "He who will never use a form in public prayer casts away the wisdom of the past. He who will use only forms casts away the hope of utterance to be given by the Spirit at present." Two Scripture lessons with an ordered lectionary from the church year are advocated. The sermon should be thought of not as distinct from worship, but as an integral part of it.

Baptism of children should not be given "unless there is prospect of Christian discipline and nurture within the home or Christian Society. For apart from that, baptism can so easily degenerate into a magical rite instead of a saving grace." The Evangelical significance of Holy Communion is presented at its best with the recommendation that in general it be accompanied by a full service of worship and sermon. Also, "to have great churchly Communion rarely, and at them to use the Presbyterian mode at which the whole of the membership remains seated as if round a common table and is served by elders, thus suggesting the communal aspect of the Supper; and to have very frequent Communion in which the individual aspect is emphasized, either after morning or evening services, and at these to use the Anglican mode, whereby each communicant advances to the table and receives the elements separately."

There is no discussion of the offering, which in present practice is one of the weakest parts in Protestant services. Either we ought to make less of it as a means of gathering up the congregation's loose change, or infinitely more of it as a symbol of the dedication not only of the gifts but of the worshipers to God.

The second part of the book traces the history of worship in the Methodist movement in England, with John Wesley's insistence that the gathering of his people for preaching, fellowship, and prayer should not be a substitute for, but only a complement to the corporate worship in the Church. The Methodist emphasis on the sermon arose partly from the fact that it was assumed that the worshipers would also take part in liturgical worship in their churches. Also, this accounts for the fact that John Wesley did not prepare a Sunday service for the societies in England as he did for those in America. When, after Wesley's death, the Methodist societies fully separated from the Church, a compromise was arrived at, giving local freedom as to whether or not the liturgy of the Church should be used. Since the reunion of English Methodism, there has been a conscious return to the possible role of the Methodist Church as a bridge between the Anglican and the other Free Churches, and therefore, more appreciation and use of the traditional English liturgy.

An interesting account is given of the origins and development of two distinctive Methodist services, the Love Feast and the Watch Night, both of which were adapted from Moravian practices, although the Love Feast was known also among the Anabaptists and Puritans. The Love Feast was, in some ways, a substitute

for the Communion which was reserved for the Church. The Watch Night originally was not associated primarily with the New Year, but was held monthly on the Friday nearest the full moon. This was not because of any lunar significance, but in order to have light for the homeward journey.

It would have been useful to one who would like to trace the history of Methodist worship, if in his bibliography Mr. Bishop had listed chronologically the various manuals of worship referred to in the text.

PAUL BURT

The Wesley Foundation, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Restoring Worship. By CLARICE M. BOWMAN. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. pp. 223. \$2.50.

Clarice Bowman's philosophy of worship places her in good company. She is one of the increasing number of contemporary Christian leaders who insist that the worship of God is primary, that as the late Archbishop William Temple said, "The Church exists, first and foremost, to be the fellowship of those who worship God in Christ." Writes Miss Bowman, "A church's first job is to lead people in the worship of God, the Great Answer" (p. 48). Her book is an appeal for restoration of Christian worship to its rightful place in the life of the redeemed and redeeming community. It is also an exposition of practical methods whereby this high end may be progressively realized in any local congregation.

This reviewer came to Miss Bowman's book fresh (or jaded) from reading over fifty examination papers in a seminary course on public worship. (There is at least one theological school in which instruction in public worship is required of all students preparing for the pulpit and pastoral ministry! *vide* page 32.) Doubtless due to concentration on the material submitted by theologues of high quality, my first impression of the early pages of this book was not too favorable. Here, I thought, is a discursive and somewhat hortatory tract on a vital theme by a well-intentioned but not too profound student of worship. Was it because my mental diet consisted largely of fare provided by such writers as Evelyn Underhill, W. D. Maxwell, W. L. Sperry, that Miss Bowman's literary style seemed too journalistic and folksy?

As I read further and more sympathetically, I revised my first opinion. This is an admirable introduction to the central concern of the church in the hands of interested laymen, particularly those entrusted with teaching children and youth. Section IV, "With Children and Youth," is the author at her best. Here Miss Bowman brings her wide and rich experience and faith to bear upon one of the most significant areas of need and possibility within the Christian community. That which the hypercritical eye of the reviewer tended to regard as undue folksiness in style enhances the value of the book for readers unused to a more pedantic approach. Large territory is surveyed by Miss Bowman, and in most areas she proves a helpful guide. Inevitably there are sections where she expounds the obvious, but happily never as a clamorous exponent. Moderns need to be reminded more than instructed, and the author does both with competence and charm.

Pastors who purchase this book for their church school library and for the laymen whom they hope will develop a concern for creative worship, will do well themselves to read, mark, and apply much of the chapter entitled "The Arts in the Service of Religion." Specifically indicated for meditation are the comments on

prayers, such as: "Too often the pastoral prayer degenerates into a peculiar sermonette with one ear cocked to the audience" (p. 152). Nor can shepherds of tender and sometimes recalcitrant boys and girls be reminded too often that "children are people," who can be guided into enlarging experiences of the Spirit only as their guides love, trust, and learn from them.

A few minor errors may be detected. Is not Arthur John Gossip referred to rather than A. E. Gossip on page 43? Did our Lord speak in the synagogue on Sundays, as stated on page 95? One fairly brief book cannot contain everything which every reader would like, but a chapter on our Christian heritage of public worship would have been helpful and relevant. Certainly a profitable addition would have been a bibliography of books Miss Bowman considers useful for further study.

DAVID A. MACLENNAN

Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

The Hebrew Impact on Western Civilization. Edited by DAGOBERT D. RUNES.
New York: The Philosophical Library, 1951. pp. xiv+922. \$10.00.

Here is a volume whose opening pages lead one to view it with suspicion. The preface frankly warns the reader that it is Jewish propaganda. The editor is understandably bitter toward the Nazis and the Germans. He speaks sweepingly and critically of "the Christian nations of the Western world," as though they were really Christian, and gives no recognition of the continuing struggle of the Christian gospel with elements which are hostile to it. Moreover, the dimensions of the tome are discouraging even to the patient reader, and are quite forbidding to those who must have ideas and information conveyed to them in capsule form.

Yet as one goes farther into the volume, he is more and more impressed. To be sure, here is propaganda, but that propaganda has brought together an amazing array of facts. Then, too, even if one does not read every word but merely pages the book through, sampling it here and there, the very size breeds respect. Eighteen authors, not all of them Jews, have presented various aspects of the Jewish contribution to Western civilization, and the names and official connections of a large proportion of them give one confidence in the dependability of what they are saying. The volume is intended primarily for Americans and properly begins with a chapter on the Hebraic foundations of American democracy. It goes on to tell of Jews who have been prominent in sociology and political science, of Jews who have served the United States in public office, and of the part which Jews have had in social service, the natural sciences, medicine, music, art, the dance, literature, the drama, journalism, geographic exploration, war, the law, religion, and philosophy. Even more than nine hundred pages do not permit discursiveness. Several of the chapters give one the impression of being catalogues of names, so many have been the individuals who have left their impression upon the life of the Occident.

However, it may not be captious to point out that, great though the obligation of Western civilization to the Jews undoubtedly is, most of the men enumerated have labored in a cultural context which has been even more shaped by Christianity than by Judaism. Although Christianity is deeply indebted to Judaism, it is by no means simply a variant of that faith. Its distinctive features are radically new. That Jews have added so much to the life of the West is not due alone or primarily to Judaism. Christianity has had a profound effect upon a large proportion of the Jews, for con-

siously or unconsciously they have been moulded by it. Just because a Jew is a Jew by heredity, it does not necessarily mean that his contribution has been because of the Hebrew faith and culture.

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

Sterling Professor of Missions and Oriental History, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Edited by JAMES B. PRITCHARD. Princeton: The Princeton University Press, 1950. pp. xix-526. \$15.00.

This magnificent book represents a "must" for every library and every individual interested in clearly and accurately translated texts, outside of the Old Testament, of the literatures of the ancient Near East. To list the names of the translators, all of whom have faithfully rendered the original tongues into attractive English with felicitous competence, is almost alone sufficient warrant of the singular worth of this fascinating volume. All of them, W. F. Albright, H. L. Ginsberg, Albrecht Goetze, S. N. Kramer, T. J. Meek, A. L. Oppenheim, R. H. Pfeiffer, A. Sachs, E. A. Speiser, F. J. Stephens, and J. A. Wilson, under the obviously firm, informed, and diplomatic editorship of James B. Pritchard, have contributed translations, crowned with brief introductions and buttressed with illuminating footnotes, which form together the finest single introduction to the literatures and languages of the ancient Near East that has ever been produced.

The arrangement of the texts was determined in accordance with literary types as discovered in each of the cultural and linguistic areas of the ancient Near East, and with an eye to their relationship to the writings of the Old Testament. The likenesses and differences between the literature and ideas of the Bible and those of the surrounding cultures are thus highlighted. In addition to useful indices of biblical references and of the names mentioned in the translations, the texts included in this volume have also been listed according to languages, to enable examining them readily in relationship to the linguistic or cultural areas of their origins.

There are those who will be able with reason to cavil at certain omissions, but none who can deny the accolade of high excellence to the choice of texts and translations included and to the method and manner of editorship.

NELSON GLUECK

President, The Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Deep Is the Hunger. By HOWARD THURMAN. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951. pp. x-212. \$2.50.

Dr. Thurman, beloved pastor of the Church for the Fellowship of All Peoples in San Francisco, here gives us a greatly enlarged third edition of the meditations written originally for his church calendar. These are grouped under three headings: "A Sense of History," "A Sense of Self," and "A Sense of Presence." His subtitle is "Meditations for Apostles of Sensitiveness," and the book is offered especially to "those who are intent upon establishing islands of fellowship in a sea of racial, religious, and national tensions."

"To have a sense of what is vital, a basic and underlying awareness of life and its potentialities at every level of experience, this is to be an Apostle of Sensitiveness."

Quite a few of the earlier meditations show this sense of what is vital entirely in the field of relations between man and man. There is a wealth of imagination in this writing—a sense of the grandeur of the natural creation and of the broad sweep of history, combined with delight in small beauties and homely down-to-earth stories of everyday life. There is sensitive and discriminating use of familiar Scripture, also occasional pleasant borrowings from Jewish tradition and Buddhist Scripture.

In a discussion of the ethical issue of compromise, using as a parable certain habits of trees, he says, "A careful examination of any man's life would reveal that at one point he bends with the wind and keeps on living, while at another point he defies the wind and is quite prepared to be brought crashing to the ground." Again, "Sometimes I think that patience is one of the great characteristics that distinguishes God from man. God knows how to wait, dynamically; everybody else is in a hurry." Pride can either take its obvious form or masquerade as humility: "Pride causes one to exaggerate his significance or insignificance, either by claiming for himself more than he knows to be true or by claiming for himself less than he knows to be true." "In the presence of human need, the Christian is faced with the subtle temptation to substitute indignation for some practical step of ministry." "Are you a member of Self-righteousness Anonymous?"

"A sense of Presence," the section which logically should be the most definitely concerned with God, is the briefest of the three; and even this concludes untheologically with the sentences, "Inasmuch as I do not live or die unto myself, it is of the essence of wisdom for me conscientiously to live and die in the profound awareness of other people. The statement, 'Know thyself,' has been taken mystically from the statement, 'Thou hast seen thy brother, thou hast seen thy God.'" One feels that, real as God is in the awareness of Howard Thurman, he could almost, like Martin Buber, subscribe to the seemingly unorthodox definition, "God is the I-thou relation."

The book closes with the section, "For the Quiet Time," consisting of twenty-five "working papers" (prose and poetry) which he has used for group meditation periods in his church.

E. H. L.

The Pendle Hill Reader. Edited by HERRYMON MAURER. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951. pp. xii-208. \$2.75.

This unusual book contains eight writings which have appeared over a period of years as Pendle Hill pamphlets. All the authors have written or lectured for Pendle Hill, the thoroughly alive and "concerned" religious-educational community maintained by the Society of Friends near Philadelphia. Most but not all the writers are Friends. Elton Trueblood in his introduction describes the book as "religious literature, rather than literature about religion," and compares Pendle Hill to the Jansenists' Port Royal in the seventeenth century—a community in which the writers have shared so deeply that each writes out of the common experience, not only his own. At the same time there appears considerable diversity of outlook and an impression of catholicity, not sectarianism. To the present reviewer, who was privileged for some years to share in that goodly fellowship, this is no surprise.

The book opens with "The Reality of the Spiritual World," by Thomas R. Kelly, a professor of philosophy at Haverford who, a few years before his death, found his thinking and his life illumined by an authentic mystical experience. "Christ in

Catastrophe" is the testimony of a saintly German Quaker, Emil Fuchs, a religious socialist teacher who was imprisoned under Hitler, endured severe illness, family separation, and the loss of his daughter by mental illness and death. He concludes, "The challenge of the living Christ is behind catastrophe; it is in it, beside it, through it. . . . By taking our task in suffering, forgetting ourselves and becoming his instruments—thus we become real."

Howard H. Brinton, Director of Pendle Hill, contributes "The Quaker Doctrine of Inward Peace," and Gilbert Kilpack, extension secretary, "Our Hearts Are Restless." Dora Willson, lecturer and counselor to students, combines insights from years of study of the Gospels with research in Jungian psychology in "The Self to the Self." We have a chapter from Douglas Steere on "Community and Worship," and one from the revered and prolific Rufus M. Jones, "Rethinking Quaker Principles." The book closes with Arnold J. Toynbee's lecture, "Christianity and Civilisation," published first by Pendle Hill in 1947 and later included in *Civilisation on Trial*. His thesis is: "If religion is a chariot, it looks as if the wheels on which it mounts towards Heaven may be the periodic downfalls of civilisations on Earth. . . . The continuous upward movement of religion may be served and promoted by the cyclic movement of civilisations round the cycle of birth—death—birth."

E. H. L.

Vo

Col

The
The
Pro
On
The
Cha
Stev
The
The
The
Boo
Boo
Inde

Copyr